THE BROTHERHOOD OF MEN

OR, CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

REV. W. UNSWORTH.

WHS

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MEN;

OR, CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

THE

BROTHERHOOD OF MEN;

OR,

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM UNSWORTH,

AUTHOR OF "THE AGGRESSIVE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY,"
"SELF-CULTURE AND SELF-RELIANCE,"
ETC., ETC.

"Am I my brother's keeper?"

Second Edition.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR, AT THE
WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,
2, CASTLE-STREET, CITY-ROAD;
SOLD AT 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
1881.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY BEVERIDGE AND MILLER,
HOLBORN PRINTING WORKS, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, W.C.

PREFACE.

To me it appears that Christian Sociology is one of the most important subjects that can possibly engage the attention of Church workers; while, perhaps, it is one of the most neglected topics of the age, by both Christian students and philanthropists generally. If these pages tend in any degree to promote the interest of the public in the study of Christian Sociology—and especially the interest of Christian ministers, and of organisers of Christian and philanthropic labour—I shall have all the reward I seek.

I am deeply anxious that all who are concerned for the welfare of society, and who in any way scheme and work and give for the elevation of the people, should thoroughly ponder the laws and

lessons of the New Testament, which I hold to be in perfect harmony with all that is truest and noblest in the principles and methods of modern science.

I have only to add that this is a revised and greatly enlarged edition.

W. U.

BOLLINGTON,
January 18, 1881.

CONTENTS.

—:o:—

I.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS PHYSICAL ASPECTS.

PAGE

I. The Importance of Humanity 3

II. The Bible and Evolution 13

III. Natural Lessons 42

II.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS SOCIAL ASPECTS.

I. Can there be a Christian Science of Society? . 82

II. Socialism and Christianity 118

III. Fundamental Principles of Christian Sociology. 164

IV. Social Lessons 212

III.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS SPIRITUAL ASPECTS.

I. Improved Methods of Christian Work 270

II. Christian Economics 296

III. Spiritual Lessons 324

I.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS PHYSICAL ASPECTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMANITY.

IT is the proud boast of many an aristocrat that he can trace his descent from a long line of distinguished ancestors. He glories in the fact of belonging to an ancient and honourable family; and sometimes looks with supreme contempt on men of plebeian blood. We greatly wonder what real or reasonable objection can be taken to his going a few centuries further back, except that then he had ancestors very much like the ancestors of common people. We greatly wonder, again, what real or reasonable objection can be taken to his going some thousands of years further back, as then he would get to the root of the family-tree, and greatly enlarge the circle of his relations. If there be any virtue in dating far back, then the argument, taken on its own merits, implies that the farther back the greater the credit and the more abundant cause for glorying. If men boast that the blood of a dozen earls runs in their veins, then the argument, pushed to its logical issue, shows that we have all of us proportionately greater reason to boast on the ground that we belong to the far more ancient aristocracy of Eden. On this principle we see the absurdity and hollowness of attempting to estimate human greatness according to birth or circumstances. Moral worth and intelligence alone form the basis of true greatness. We see, too, that we can all go further back in the pedigree of

God's aristocracy than any scion of British or European aristocracy can go in his family pedigree. We are thus brought face to face with the precious and refreshing fact —in these days of hollow pretence—that the aristocracy of Divine creation was an aristocracy of labour. The most ancient and honourable aristocrats were working men. Adam was a gardener. Cain was a tiller of the ground. Abel was a keeper of sheep. And if you come further down the stream of history you find that Jesus was a working carpenter, Matthew was a tax-gatherer, Peter and John and James were fishermen, and Paul was a tent-maker.

> "Trust me, Clara Vere de Vere,
> From yon blue heavens above us bent
> The grand old gardener and his wife
> Smile at the claims of long descent.
> Howe'er it be, it seems to me
> 'Tis only noble to be good.
> Kind hearts are more than coronets,
> And simple faith than Norman blood."

Walter Thornbury, in his life of Turner, the painter, says: "I can claim no 'blue blood' for Turner, nor do I want to. All old families have sprung originally from peasants; and every second peasant family will one day be noble. There is no rank in souls or bodies; and our heralds have now grown mere inventors of ancestors for uneasy men who have grown rich and wish to bear arms. Pedigree and genealogy—both are vanity, and I put them behind me as dead and gone."

It is both amusing and provoking to examine the artificial distinctions made between the different classes of the community. You find it impossible to ascertain what really constitutes "a gentleman." The aristocracy will not

associate with business people for the very singular reason that business people are not gentlemen. According to this social theory, one person is a gentleman because he does absolutely nothing in trade for the commercial prosperity of his country, and another person is not a gentleman because he honestly endeavours to build up the manufacturing industries of the nation.

A lady opens a boarding school, and announces to the intelligent public that she will only take the children of gentlefolks. You ask whose children go, and are amazed to find that Robinson's children are excluded, though he is a very large and respectable draper; but Jones's children are not excluded, though he is only a small manufacturer with hardly salt to eat. Robinson is educated, intelligent, and of fine Christian character; Jones is uneducated, ignorant, and brutish. According to this social theory, Jones is a gentleman because he happens to be a tradesman in a small *wholesale* business; and Robinson is not a gentleman because he happens to be a tradesman in a large *retail* business. By-and-by Jones finds he cannot make business answer, and so he goes to keep a small shop, and singular to say he by that act ceases to be a gentleman; Robinson retires from business, having made an ample fortune, and by that very act strangely enough he becomes a gentleman. Do we not see the vanity and hollowness of these artificial distinctions? And yet there are people who would sell their souls to Satan,—if such people have souls,—to get introduced into what is called "good society."

Some say that professional men are gentlemen,—doctors, lawyers, clergymen, ministers, tutors, and so on. They may be humble or exalted in their origin, they may have had

a liberal or a very limited education, they may be wealthy or extremely poor, but as professional men they are allowed to be gentlemen. The lady of a country squire once went so far as to allow that even the son of a Wesleyan minister is a gentleman. It was quite an effort to stretch her liberality so far, but she was perfectly right if that adult son has character and intelligence.

When the Archbishop of Canterbury married Prince Albert to Queen Victoria, he asked, "Wilt thou have this *woman* to thy wedded wife?" When a traveller in America attended a marriage, he was much struck with the altered wording; the minister said, "Wilt thou have this *lady* to thy wedded wife?" Nature is above rank, the woman above the queen, humanity greater than title. And the Americans have not advanced in civilisation and intelligence by substituting lady for woman in their marriage service.

A man gets married—marries a fine woman: and a man might do an immensely worse thing; but you hear the marriage referred to in the railway or omnibus, and the language employed is, "Mr. So-and-so has got married, and has married well; he has married money." Not a word about the intelligence, thrift, diligence, virtue, and great excellence of his wife. The grand wifely qualities are not once mentioned, apparently not even thought of, but the wife's circumstances. And you mostly find the same idea in all ordinary conversation—that circumstances are everything, and the grand attributes of humanity nothing.

Now, whatever attaches supreme importance to circumstances, and keeps human nature out of view, is a heavy loss to the race. It is moral worth and culture, Christian

principle and intelligence, which make the gentleman,—not outward circumstances. Let us look at *humanity* and value *that* more than human surroundings. Properly speaking, the man is more important than the gentleman, in the popular acceptation of the term gentleman. We mean man according to the Divine ideal—man as God first made him, and as God intends him to become by the agency of Christianity.

"Well," some easy-going person says, who has narrow and superficial views of human nature, "what is the use of disturbing the customs and notions of the community?" We reply, if the ideas and habits of people stand in the way of the true interests of humanity, the sooner the disturbing element is put into operation the better. If pride, or ignorance, or selfishness, or anything else has set up artificial distinctions which turn the minds of men from the more important to the less important concerns of the race, the sooner these distinctions are seen to be hollow and worthless the better for all men. And if men, seeing the hollowness and worthlessness of these distinctions, are led to value themselves, and to improve themselves, rather than to seek admission into "good society," what a real and substantial gain is obtained for the race! Especially if they be led to value *human nature* as such, and to put forth wise and loving efforts for its improvement, in addition to a proper estimate of their own nature and a diligent attention to its improvement, what a glorious advance in the progress of humanity is secured! To call people working in mills "hands," and not human beings, provoked the ire of Karl Marx, one of the ablest socialistic writers, and in burning indignation he poured forth one withering rebuke after another.

If we be Christians, and if God's Word be any authority for us, let us remember that it does not introduce the notion of "caste" and "class interests;" at any rate, it does not uphold most of the modern ideas and customs of society. It does not speak of "superiors" and "inferiors;" of "the better sort of people;" of "the upper class" and "the lower class;" and of the "masses" or "residuum," and all that kind of thing. It treats with becoming respect and gravity the importance of humanity, the worth and value of human nature in itself and for its own sake, and for Christ's sake. And the more we adopt this method, and follow in the Scriptural line, the better for us and for others around us. The disparaging phrases above mostly mean that some are poorer and that others are richer; but at the same time the phrases convey the notion that somehow the wealthy are superior or better, simply and solely because of their wealth; and that the poor are inferior or low, simply and solely because of their poverty. Now this, we hold, is not the teaching of the New Testament; and it ought not to be countenanced by Christian people. The importance and value of *man as man* is rather to be asserted and maintained.

It is a marvellous illustration of the weakness and degeneracy of modern society, that people so commonly put down the worth of a man to be his balance at the banker's, or the houses he calls his own, or the broad acres he may happen to possess. You hear daily that Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown is worth so much. Not a word about the man's intelligence, or his character, or his usefulness, or anything of that kind; but simply that the man is worth o many pounds sterling. And people are filled with awe,

and hold their breath, while they listen to the story of the commercial success of Mr. Jonas Moneygrub, who died worth a million and a half of money, but forget to ask if the wonderful Mr. Jonas Moneygrub ever did anything in his life to elevate humanity mentally and morally, or to elevate himself above mere money-getting. Probably the whole range of Mr. Jonas Moneygrub's ideas, like those who speak about him with bated breath, was "getting on in life," which, being interpreted, is simply securing material wealth at the sacrifice of all higher interests.

Now we enter our earnest protest against treating humanity in any such method. To think and speak of men as "well connected," because they have wealthy relations; as "respectable," merely because they possess considerable property; as "important people," because of the money they have in the funds; as "fine folks," because they drive a carriage and pair; and as "among the best families in the neighbourhood," because they have larger balances at the banker's, and spend more money with the tradespeople than any other families, is to degrade human nature, and to place it infinitely below the teaching of Christianity. Scripture asks us to look at man with his thoughts, aspirations, and capabilities, with his soul and intellect, with his noble origin and immortal destiny; at man as redeemed, and, in his purified character, associated with Christ in His great renewing and elevating work; but we ignobly contemplate his material circumstances, and value him for his pounds, shillings, and pence.

On this principle Christ would never have sought "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," would never have preached the Gospel to "the poor," and would not have

sent His servants to the neglected and outcasts among the nations. The whole theory and practice of Christianity, as received pure and fresh from the Hand of its Divine Author, establish not the importance of wealth, or mere outward circumstances, but the importance of humanity itself. Those who value man according to his outward prosperity, or the length of his purse, may fittingly be asked by each fellow-man, "Is thy servant a dog? With my poverty, my want of culture, my moral and spiritual degradation, am I not a man, and thy human brother?" Robert Burns never sang more sweetly and truly than when he said:

> "The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
> The man's the gowd for a' that."

He got this splendid sentiment from Christianity. The New Testament always puts humanity above human circumstances, the man above the man's worth in money.

Napoleon said, "I am my own ancestry." One of the Roman writers speaks of the uselessness of Romans boasting of noble ancestors, as their ancestors were all either "shepherds or robbers." Our own aristocrats, a few centuries back, had fathers who were of the people, and who did some deed for which they were ennobled. The Chinese ennoble the predecessors of a man who has distinguished himself, which is better than our method, as it comes nearer to the Christian method: that is, going up the stream to the fountain as well as down the stream to the great ocean, and putting value on the qualities that produced the great man. The more we look at man's deeds and moral qualities, and the less we look at his means and circumstances, the nearer we shall approach to the correct view of

humanity. It is not ancestors, it is not wealth, it is not anything outward that makes the man; it is what the man is and is capable of: the possibilities in the man, and the use the man makes of those possibilities: the thinking, the feeling, the acting, the whole life and what comes out of it here and for ever, *that* makes the man, and shows the importance of humanity as infinitely raised above all mere material considerations and circumstances.

Of course a man cannot fairly rush to the conclusion, on the other hand, that he, of all men, is the grand man simply and solely because he is poor. He may be as poor as Lazarus, and yet he may be almost as evil as Satan, and as ignorant as a savage. Neither wealth nor poverty make the man according to the New Testament idea, but goodness and intelligence, or "knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness." Many people appear to be ready enough to accept the teaching of Christianity when it hits a class above them or a class below them; but they are not quite so comfortable when it hits them. Many poor people like those portions of the New Testament which deal heavy blows at the vices of the rich, and many rich people like those portions of the New Testament which deal heavy blows at the vices of the poor. But Christianity soars immensely above class distinctions, and, looking down impartially upon the whole race, says, "Fear God, and keep His commandments, for this is the whole man"—the complete man, the manly man, the man who is a man, whatever his earthly lot may be.

It seems to be a refinement of burlesque—the highest possible ridicule that can be passed on man by the most accomplished genius of caricature—to value the worth of

man according to his money value; man made in the image of God, made a little lower than the angels, made the lord of creation and God's representative on earth, with authority over all the inferior creatures; man redeemed by the blood of the Son of God, linked to Christ by the same human nature, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, lifted by Christianity to fellowship with Heaven, and, on his way to everlasting blessedness, permitted, as a partner with Christ in His great work of elevating and ennobling the race, to be a "worker together with God" for the accomplishment of the world's moral and spiritual purification; man with his soul, his intellect, his conscience, his ideas, his history, his destiny, with all that man is and will be for time and eternity: to estimate the worth of such a being at the rate of his material wealth, is the very climax of burlesque and the perfection of caricature.

CHAPTER II.

THE BIBLE AND EVOLUTION.

ACCORDING to the best and holiest of books, there lived in the distant past, somewhere in the East, in a now unknown paradise, a fair and happy couple; and from them it is commonly admitted that we all of us originally sprang. If there be any truth of a substantial and reliable character in the theory of Evolution or Development, as it is variously called, then all we can say is that such truth is very difficult to get at, and very hard to receive by those who are unscientific, and who have therefore to receive information second-hand, without being able to go through original investigation for themselves. Indeed no one scientific man can know for himself, as a specialist, all the sciences concerned in demonstrating Evolution. So scientists themselves must, many of them or all of them, accept the testimony of their fellow-workers, and be unable to investigate many points for themselves. Therefore as many things are taken on trust, as yet, we think our true policy is patiently to wait for further light on certain matters, and not to abandon our ancient beliefs without more trustworthy and satisfactory evidence. To us it seems that this is far from being a question of purely physical science, as so many clever men appear to suppose. We think that mental and moral science is largely concerned in it; and when physical

science claims to settle moral questions it leaves its own legitimate territory, and very improperly invades the territory belonging to the science of mind and the science of religion. It is David going to fight Goliath of Gath, not with manageable sling and stone as reason dictates, but with the unmanageable armour of Saul.

Monkeys and men are so different in feet, and legs, and brain; in head, and skin, and teeth; in toes, and thumbs, and eyes; in fact, in the general conformation of the body, that they cannot be fairly classed together, according to many eminent naturalists, as stated by Dr. Hall in his analytical synopsis of the *Natural History of Man*, prefixed to Dr. Pickering's work on *The Races of Man*. Looking at man and the monkey, it is at least singular if man is only a developed ape. How did the monkey of ages ago succeed in climbing up to the present human culture and civilisation? Where can we read the interesting history of the struggle up to manhood from monkeyhood? Oscar Schmidt maintains that the animals from which man sprang are now extinct, that we have lost all trace of them, and that our museums are "destitute of the fossil progenitors of man." Is this science, or is it simply supposition? What is the evidence in this case of the extinct race or races of animals from which the human race immediately came? To say the least, this is a very convenient way of filling up a great gap. We ask very naturally for the animal forefathers of men, and we are simply told that all such animals are dead and gone ages upon ages ago, and have never been seen or heard of since; in fact, that not the least trace of them, so far as man knows, is left either in the earth or upon it. We say all this is very strange, and wonder how any one

knows that such animal progenitors of man ever existed. And yet on such a foundation Evolution takes its stand, and requests us to abandon our belief in the statements of Holy Scripture respecting man's origin. Is it not more rational to wait for further and more convincing evidence before we give up Christianity in its relation to man's creation, redemption, and immortality? Have we not the right to look at the moral and intellectual character of man; at soul and conscience and the glorious capability of indefinite progress on earth, and then at progress through the everlasting ages according to the Christian Scriptures?

Look at the identity of physical formation through the countless generations of men, under conditions the most dissimilar as to cold and heat, food and clothing, freedom and slavery. Look at man's erect attitude, the two hands, the slow and gradual development of the body, but especially at the use of reason, and at the consequent perfectibility of humanity; and then remember that these are the attributes common to the negro and to all the inferior races as well as to the Europeans,—and that they are everywhere peculiar to man. The negro is not necessarily an inferior being. Give him the same opportunities of culture and ages of privileges, and the negro will equal the European. As it is, some in the West Indies, whose fathers were in slavery a half century ago, put to shame many white people when looked at in the light of intellectual progress. A trained missionary has taken a poor black youth, and found that that poor black youth has soon learned as much as he could teach the youth of the Greek Testament. This we have on the best authority—the authority of the missionary himself, the Rev. Joseph Hammond. And the

Rev. Thomas Williams, late missionary to Fiji, said when visiting England some years ago, "that when he looked at the slowness of people to learn in England, and the rapidity with which the poor Fijians acquired knowledge, he was positively ashamed of the colour of his skin." But Oscar Schmidt takes great pains to caution us against the evidence of philanthropists and missionaries. We do not quite see why he should do so. True science, we imagine, will welcome light from all sources. It cannot be afraid of its little pet theories being upset by information from any quarter whatsoever. The speculator, the man who guesses, who supposes what is convenient for his hypothesis, may fear facts opposing his pretty little schemes; but true science stands like a rock and invites the most severe tests that can be applied, and every possible kind of test from every possible quarter. And when Oscar Schmidt asks that only the evidence of scientific men may be admitted on the question of Evolution, it looks as if he feared the application of all kinds of tests, unconsciously betraying the weakness of certain scientific speculations.

Mostly, men of science have shot keen darts at Christian ministers, and sneered at theologians as if they were the most ignorant and incapable of men. But let any impartial person read carefully through a dozen books on Evolution, and he will be astonished at the gigantic assumptions and illogical reasonings of some men of science. He will be surprised at the narrowness and illiberality of science, on the part of some of its most devoted disciples. This, we conceive and hold, is not true science, nor the true scientific spirit. It may be right and logical from the standpoint of these scientists. But if, like Mr. Herbert Spencer, they

maintain that Evolution excludes a Creator, and the laws of nature destroy the Providence of God—and that we are all therefore left orphans in the world, to pass away like common cattle—we rise up and protest that all our characteristics have not been fairly and fully considered. Our case has only been half looked at by these scientists; and we say, Gentlemen, there is another side—please ponder that too. Mr. Herbert Spencer is a clever thinker and writer of half-truths; he only sees the side of nature, and reasons as if there were no other side to be considered for one moment: no personal God, no Providential Government of the world, and no true science of man. This method of deciding matters reminds us of the sportsman who went to India, and, when he was returning home, entered into conversation with a missionary who was also returning on the same vessel. The conversation turned on the Hindus who had been won to Christianity. "Oh!" said the sportsman, there are no native Christians. I have been there for so long a time, and I never saw one." By-and-by the conversation turned on tiger hunting, and the missionary said, "Oh! there are no tigers to hunt. I have been in India so many years, and I never saw one." People mostly see what they go to see or want to see. Some scientists, it seems, are no exception. They do not find Christianity in the rocks, or among fishes and animals, and so they say there is none anywhere. All things have their proper spheres, and Christianity has its sphere; and if scientists will look in the true sphere of the Christian religion they will find facts as real as any facts in nature.

The doctrine of Evolution, as hitherto taught by its most devoted disciples, does not account for the whole facts of

human nature, as we find human nature to-day, and as we know it in all history. Such a doctrine is a very partial and imperfect statement of the case, as it leaves out some essential elements. This modern doctrine is only as yet a mere theory; it has not advanced beyond a working hypothesis. By-and-by it may be found by scientists that it does not even cover the whole physical facts, as is the case apparently in relation to colour blindness, &c., and then the theory will be abandoned, as they have abandoned multitudes of other theories, which, when fairly tried, were found wanting. Brutes do not now, and, so far as we know, never did, in the most distant manner, approach man in arts and sciences, in literature, in architecture, in languages, in painting and music, in statesmanship, in the profession of arms, in commerce, in medicine, or in moral knowledge and Christian worship. Even savage tribes can learn the arts of civilised life, can sing the high praises of God, and reverently adore Him. But you cannot teach brutes to do all this. The gap between animals and man is manifestly so great that we find it difficult indeed to accept the theory of Evolution in its relation to the human race. When we get from brutes sublime music, splendid paintings, gorgeous architecture, and the ten thousand Christian graces associated with Christian intelligence, we shall not be able any longer to deny our relationship to them. But till we get further evidence of brutes possessing some of the characteristics of man as he is known to us in the historical period, we hesitate to accept Evolution. Let it be distinctly understood that we are not writing against enlightened and consistent science, but against the persistent infidel perversion and misapplication of scientific

facts: against a science, therefore, which is morally and religiously mad, and which tries, in every way, to deal a blow at Christianity, or tries to knock it out of the way altogether. It is this irrational science which departs from the calm, fair, reasonable, and patient spirit of all true science, which alone we protest against and condemn: a science that will not tolerate miracles, that bids us give up the teaching and work of Christ, and politely bows Christianity out of the world as a thing that was only fitted for the education of the world in its moral and intellectual infancy. That is unworthy of the name of science which does not cover all the facts concerning man's character and history; and Evolution at present is not a universally established scientific doctrine, like gravitation, and it is not universally accepted by scientific men. Were a banker to leave several important items out of the account he could never balance the books. So it is in Evolution; and if the scientist will persist in leaving out of the account the intellectual and spiritual characteristics of man, he cannot get a true solution of the problem before him. Look at the reason of man, his gift of speech, his marvellous capability of progress, his complete free will in moral and social affairs, his conscience, his consciousness of the existence of God, and then say if any account of man leaving out these attributes of his manhood can be satisfactory.

We yield to none in our admiration for the self-denying and untiring efforts of scientists. We bless God for what this noble army has accomplished for medicine, sanitary reform, and the enlargement of the territory of general knowledge. But we are perplexed with their sweeping

and conflicting theories. And while we are thankful for all undoubted scientific facts, we find it difficult to accept much of the theorising of some scientific writers, who appear to be more inspired by indignation against Christianity than by a pure patient love of scientific truth, and who, to say the least, do not always preserve the calm, impartial, scientific spirit.

We should remember, too, that all professed men of science are not, properly speaking, scientists, any more than all ministers of the Gospel are, really and truly, theologians. We should, therefore, be very cautious in accepting the statements especially of incompetent men, on either side, as to points in dispute between theology and science; and also sufficiently careful in weighing the statements of the most capable men, because of the constant human liability to error. Neither theologians nor men of science are infallible, while infallibility is claimed for both the revelation of Nature and the revelation of the Bible. So that wild statements on either the side of theology or science should not be allowed to prejudice either subject. Mr. Oscar Schmidt, in his work on *The Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism*, published in the International Scientific Series, appears to look with infinite pity on those who require "a personal God" for the work of creation; Mr. Herbert Spencer says "a personal God is unthinkable;" and the Vatican Council anathematises all "who shall say that it may at any time come to pass, in the progress of science, that the doctrines set forth by the Church must be taken in another sense than that in which the Church has ever received and yet receives them." But it does not aid the Christian cause to declaim against

science, and it does not aid the cause of science to denounce Christianity. Undoubted facts will prevail, and truth will succeed in the end. Theologians must be patient with men of science, and men of science must be patient with theologians. All are truth-seekers in their own way, and all have had to modify their theories before to-day, and may have to do so again. We do not fear for the future, either of Christianity or of science; we only fear the impatience which blinds the mind, dethrones reason, and hinders the progress of truth. Let all labour patiently, and in mutual good will, in both Bibles—the scientist in the Revelation of Nature, and the theologian in the Written Revelation; and as both Bibles have one common Author they cannot be contradictory, though the interpreters may make mistakes, and conceal the real truth, on either side. The possibility of mistake rebukes impatience and passion, and bespeaks forbearance and kindness for all sincere students of both revelations.

Now in considering the brotherhood of men, we cannot well go further back than the Sacred Records carry us. And we deem it altogether unnecessary to dwell on every particular connected with the first human pair and their immediate offspring. The main points of interest in the first family are perfectly familiar to most people. One circumstance however gave rise to a singular inquiry, and met with a singular reply. That circumstance has been vividly impressed on our imaginations — stamped on our mind and memory from childhood. After the rejected sacrifice of Cain, and the accepted sacrifice of Abel, the unprovoked murder in cold blood followed. Then the Almighty Avenger of evil deeds spoke to the murderer, putting the

question of implied responsibility: "Where is Abel thy brother?" And the heartless, godless, defiant answer returned was this: "I know not: am I my brother's keeper?" We say all the facts and circumstances connected with this first murder in the history of the human race are well understood, and need not now be gone into. But there is one point on which we lay special stress. From the Sacred Narrative we gather principles for our instruction and guidance, and principles which are universal as the race and undying as humanity. Regarding the Sacred Narrative, therefore, as casting great light on the relation in which we stand to each other, and showing the undoubted claims which our fellows have upon us, we learn that man is indeed his brother's keeper, the guardian of his brother's rights, the protector and promoter of his brother's interests. On these points we wish to place particular emphasis, because we take the doctrine of human brotherhood, legitimately expounded and logically followed out in all its relations, to be of the highest possible importance as taught in the Sacred Scriptures. Ay, and it is a doctrine peculiarly applicable in modern times, and one which it is especially necessary to preach for the perpetual guidance and practice of the people.

Men are always asking by act and deed, if not in plain speech,—"'Am I my brother's keeper?' What have I to do with the men about me? Am I bound to look after them? Let them look after their own interests. I have enough to do to mind myself and to manage my own affairs. In an age of stern strife and hot competition I have to take care to keep on my feet, and other people must do the best

they can for themselves." Of course there is a great amount of truth in all this. But while men do the best they can for their personal welfare, they are bound to extend their care to other people. If they refuse to do so, then the story of Cain and Abel will have to be told over again in ten thousand varying forms. Tyranny, bloodshed, poverty, disease, ignorance, immorality, slavery, war, the persecution of churches, the destruction of commonwealths, the downfall of dynasties, the overthrow of nations and empires—in fact, every natural social and religious evil grows out of the practical denial of human brotherhood, or is greatly increased and aggravated by it. Were this brotherhood denied and trampled on by everybody, the world could not hang together for two days. Ruin would be complete and universal.

One main point coming up here for our consideration *is the unity of the race.* This doctrine may be gathered from the direct and implied teaching of Scripture. We have in the Bible the history of one race only. The creation of man was by the direct act of God. (Gen. i. 26, 27; ii. 7.) He was not developed from a lower species under the reign and operation of law: first protoplasm, then jelly fish, then monkey, and finally man. We have no account in the Bible of such development. Beside some men of science think it very questionable indeed if there be anything like trustworthy evidence, in science itself, to support the development theory, especially as applied to man. It is not the purpose of these pages to enter minutely into the points of the development theory, or to discuss the question of the antiquity of man. The aim of this work is much more practical. But if all that the author of the

Vestiges of Creation, Mr. Darwin, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Alfred Wallis, Oscar Schmidt, Carl Vogt, Haeckel, and a host of others have taught on this subject were true, it would not by any means disprove the reign of law, which implies a Supreme Being who framed and enacted law, and also keeps it in perpetual operation. So that still the work would be Divine, and could not be fairly employed as an argument against the existence of God. And moreover if we are developed, as some men of science say, then it would still be a special point for consideration whether or not all known varieties of the human species are not really men, as we shall see by-and-by, and men with the soul mind and rights of brothers. But till we have further and clearer light on the subject we hold by the Inspired Narrative, which obviously maintains the unity of the race. "So God created man in His own image." The Bible is fairly entitled to consideration as an ancient historical book. But it is of the highest possible importance and authority when regarded as a book inspired of God. If then we allow that God in the Bible teaches men, He only speaks of one human pair created by Him. And we cannot go further back in history than the circumstances of this human creation. It was in fact the commencement of the human race. Further on in the Sacred Narrative it is stated that in the early ages of the world the whole earth was of one language and one speech (Gen. xi. 1), as evidence of one common origin, and showing clearly enough that we all at first really sprung from one common stock. Then again in the Acts of the Apostles, Paul broadly and distinctly states that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the

earth." And there is deep significance and peculiar force in this language, when we consider the notions held by the proud philosophers of Athens. They were willing to admit that the cultivated and intelligent within their own charmed circle were men and brothers, but all outside were branded as barbarians, not to be treated as belonging to the same race,—very much as many gentlemen in the present age regard and treat the negro both in Europe and America, as if the negro were a thing and not a man, a dog to be kicked or trodden on at their supreme pleasure. But Christianity looks upon all men as equals before God. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Distinctions of sex and race are lost in the lofty philosophy of the Gospel. All are spoken of as the children of the same Parent and possessing the same nature,—the offspring of one common Father, the very brothers of Christ. The Bible rises immensely above the teaching of every other book. It puts the question, "Have we not all one Father, hath not God created us?" It tells us that God is the "Father of spirits," and the "God of the spirits of all flesh." It asserts that we have all the same flesh and blood; and finally it declares a universal brotherhood established in Christ. So that if we do not reject the inspiration of Scripture we cannot well get rid of the doctrine of the unity of the race. And we confess we have no special wish to reject the doctrine that we are the sons of God not the descendants of an ape. If men sneeringly tell us we were made out of mud, well, we would rather it were so, under the touch and finish of God, than that our great-

great-great-great-grandfather should have been an African monkey. Let those who like it hold by the theory; we prefer belonging to another and higher progenitor.

The judgment of many eminent Biblical scholars and scientific men confirms this view of the unity of the human race. Baron Bunsen says: "I am also meditating a fresh development of my Philosophy of History. I begin to see that it may be proved that all the negro languages (*i.e.*, nations) are degenerated, degraded Egyptians or Indians. Adam, Noah, and all his sons were of the noblest race; and the curse of sin fell hardest on the tribes who went or were driven into the inhospitable regions of the earth. The savage is a degraded man, not man a civilised savage."* He further says: "By means of Egypt, and the researches into language and history connected with it, including the Old Testament, I have gained a solid foundation for the philosophy of the history of the human mind, which till now has been wanting to all. I can now prove, not only that the race of man cannot be older than 25,000 years, nor younger than 20,000, but also that but one course of civilisation and but one race of men has existed, with which all others of Asia and Europe can be proved to be related by blood. Finally, that in all, but one reason and one moral consciousness is revealed, by which the Kosmos of the mind's universe is constructed."† This language is clear and strong enough, and was recorded so late in life as May 31st, 1855. Even those who are only very partially acquainted with the great attainments of Bunsen, will be inclined to attach importance to his opinions. It is true an able Egyptologer (in the *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1880)

* *Memoirs.* † *Ibid.*

thinks that the weight of evidence strongly points to the general correctness of the Biblical computation; and had Bunsen been living to-day he might have modified his dates and strengthened his evidence as to the unity of the race.

But there is another name of equal weight and authority on this subject, to which we must briefly refer. Professor Max Müller shows the unity of the race from the Science of Religion and the Science of Language. In the introduction to *Chips from a German Workshop*, he states that "in language and in religion, everything new is old, and everything old is new." "The elements and roots were there, as far back as we can trace the history of man; and the history of religion, like the history of language, shows throughout a succession of new combinations of the same radical elements." "The science of language has taught us that there is order and wisdom in all languages, and that even the most degraded jargons contain the ruins of former greatness and beauty. The science of religion, I hope, will produce a similar change in our views of barbarous forms of faith and worship; and missionaries, instead of looking only for points of difference, will look out more anxiously for any common ground, any spark of true light that may still be revived, any altar that may be dedicated afresh to the true God." "There was a time when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Sclavonians, the Greeks, and the Italians, the Persians and Hindus, were living together beneath the same roof, separate from the ancestors of the Semitic (Hebrew) and Turanian races." He maintains that "the evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to with regard to ante-historical periods." Perhaps, of all living men, Professor Max Müller

is entitled to speak with confidence on this subject, and to point out to us that similarity of moral idea and similarity of speech imply identity of nature.

The Rev. J. S. Banks, who is no mean authority on this subject, stated in the Fernley Lecture on *Christianity and the Science of Religion*, given in London, 1880, "The science of religion undertook to do for the religion of the world what the science of language did for its languages. To such an undertaking there could be no preliminary objection. The phenomena of religious life were just as legitimate objects of investigation as those of language or indeed of any other department of knowledge. This science differed considerably from the philosophies of religion, several of which bore great names. These systems possessed an interest and value of their own, but they were intensely speculative. They proceeded to a great extent independently of history and experience. They were based upon and therefore varied with their author's peculiar theories of human nature, and in consequence rather excited than satisfied inquiry. The modern science of religion was far less ambitious and more practical. By classifying, comparing, and analysing the facts of religion it sought to arrive at comprehensive views of its nature and laws."

He continued: "There was no ground, then, for the attitude of distrust and reserve on the part of Christians towards this subject. They did not need to be exhorted, as they often were, to compare Christianity with other systems. That was what Christian missionaries were doing every day, and the result of such comparison would always be to set in clear relief the unique rights of Christianity.

Their attitude towards religions was the same as towards physical science. To facts verified and verifiable they could not object. Theories based upon these facts they claimed the right to challenge. He believed that the sceptical tendency was merely an infantile weakness which the manhood of science would not fail to outgrow." The Science of Religion had, first, "put the crown on the argument for the unity of the human race. It was curious how scepticism had turned completely round on this subject, and was just as anxious now to build up as it was once to destroy. To the physical evidence was now added the more cogent evidence from language and religion. Religious science had also established the fact of the universality of religion. This fact was once questioned. It was asserted that tribes had been found which showed no trace of religion. But no one asserted that now. Even so thoroughgoing a religious evolutionist as Professor Tule, of Leyden, had said, 'The statement that there are nations or tribes which possess no religion rests either on inaccurate observation or confusion of ideas.' Professor Max Müller had written to the same effect. Another valuable service rendered by this science was the evidence it had brought against the notion that all religion originated in Fetishism. This notion was a main pillar of the Comtist explanation of religion. Just as, according to some, the highest physical forms were the outgrowth of the animal, so the purest devotion and sanctity had sprung from the worship of a Fetish. It was refreshing to hear the heavy blows dealt by Professor Müller at this most irrational of monstrosities. In the lecture which he devoted to the subject he showed even at the stage of Fetishism there were many

degrees of better and worse, and that higher notions were to be found mixed up with the most abject superstitions like fading reminiscences of better days."

India was a test case, and Mr. Banks accepted the challenge. "Practically the Hindus were left to find their own way to God and make a religion for themselves from the materials supplied by nature; and Hinduism was substantially the result of that process. They had in India a specimen of what unaided human reason could effect in the discovery of religious truth—and what was the result? The science of religion gave the answer. The result might be stated in a single sentence. They had in the Vedas polytheistic nature-worship at the beginning and Pantheism at the end. After giving proof of this by several quotations from the Sacred Books, the lecturer declared it to be his conviction that the amount of religious truth to be found in the Vedas had been greatly exaggerated. He was far from denying that monotheistic tendencies were to be found in the Vedas, but he affirmed that these tendencies never took definite shape or acquired practical influence. Just at the point where Monotheism might have been expected to emerge, Pantheism emerged instead. Pantheism, not Monotheism, was the Indian solution of the problem of the universe. Even on the supposition that India was from the first under a law of simple Evolution, this was what Evolution led to. And could any one regard that as satisfactory? On any theory, was not India a demonstration of the insufficiency of human reason left to itself, and of the necessity of a higher revelation? If any people could have succeeded in finding God apart from the aid of

revelation they should have expected the Hindus to do so. Where they failed who was likely to succeed? Did it fare better with the Chinese, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, or Romans? They knew that it fared worse." He held that "the religion of India contained foreign elements," and he "differed from the evolutionary theory in its application to India." "In religion as in language there were certain main lines which never varied." "Whatever of truth and good was found in other religions was found in Christianity in finished form. Was it asked, Which Christianity? of what school, or Church, or age? He answered, the common Christianity of all Churches and ages. "They heard much about "the Church of the future." Christianity was the Church of the future. The Gospel of the first century was the Gospel of the nineteenth. Their hope for the future was not that false systems and true would blend into something higher, but that Hindu, Buddhist, Mohammedan, and Jew would recognise the Gospel of Christ as that which responded to every true instinct of the soul. Here, and here alone, was to be found the centre of unity for mankind. Christ was the centre of the world. There was not a soul that was not connected by invisible lines with Him. To men in their weary search for truth and righteousness and eternal life He said, "Come unto Me, and I will give you rest." Thus their faith stood secure that "in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth."

Mr. Thomas Cooper, the converted infidel, almost gets savage with the Evolutionists, and asks impatiently, "But

where are the facts? The facts are what we demand before we accept a theory. That is the great lesson taught us by Newton and Bacon; and we shall not depart from it. But neither Mr. Darwin, nor Professors Huxley and Tyndall, nor Mr. Herbert Spencer, nor Carl Vogt, nor Haeckel dare to assure us that Evolution is ever witnessed now, or has ever been witnessed in the past. So we say, where are the facts?" The Darwinians refer the perplexed "Lecturer on Christianity" to the "forty different kinds of wild brambles, and the twenty different kinds of roses;" "the three hundred and forty kinds of tame pigeons;" "the various breed of dogs;" "and of the power man has to alter and improve the breed of sheep and cattle and horses." "Evolution! my Darwinian friends," exclaims poor Mr. Cooper—"you have not touched it with all your facts. This is all variety: it is *not* Evolution. We need none of your pretty array of instances of variety. Variety is the stamp and seal God puts upon all He does in nature." And he goes step by step through the history of the theory of Evolution, concluding his book with a smart reply to Haeckel's pedigree of man, exposing the weakness and folly of the doctrine of Evolution.

But there is yet another name which we cannot refrain from bringing before the reader, and one of deservedly growing influence,—we mean that of the Duke of Argyll. In *Primeval Man*, he says, speaking of the unity of the human race: "We must, indeed, be very cautious in identifying the interests of religion with any interpretation (however certain we may have hitherto assumed it to be) of the language of Scripture upon subjects which are accessible to scientific research. We know from past

experience how foolish and how futile it is to do so. But, unquestionably, the unity of the human race in respect to origin is not easily separated from some principles which are of high value in our understanding both of moral duty and religious truth; and precisely in proportion as we value our belief in that unity, ought we to be ready and willing to accept any evidence on the question of man's antiquity. The older the human family can be proved to be, the more possible and probable it is that it has descended from a single pair. My own belief is that all scientific evidence is in favour of this conclusion, and I regard all new proofs of the antiquity of man as tending to establish it on a firmer basis."*

Those philosophers who contend for more than one race, deal mainly if not exclusively with man's physical nature; but man's physical nature is only a part of man, and the inferior part too. The mental and moral parts of his being are paramount elements in the question to be settled. Mind and soul must be taken into account, as well as physical constitution. We simply suggest what is a difficulty in the way of many thoughtful and intelligent Christians, as to accepting the opinions of certain scientific men with reference to Evolution and the plurality of races. It strikes us that metaphysics and spiritual religion will be the rock on which the theories of Mr. Darwin, Professors Huxley and Tyndall, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Carl Vogt and Haeckel will in the end be completely wrecked. Man is more than a material being; he is an intellectual and spiritual being too. And not a single physical philosopher has yet put his hand on one instance wherein a man-aping animal has

* *Primeval Man*, pp. 121, 127.

actually developed into a man. If there be such instances, we ought certainly to be supplied with them as undoubted historical facts in support of Evolution. But scientists are beginning to admit that it is in vain to continue the search for such facts, and so in the absence of such well-authenticated facts, we may reasonably hesitate to believe in the imperfect guessings of geological and anthropological science. The day may yet dawn when clearer and fuller light will demonstrate that the teachings of the Bible and the teachings of nature are never contradictory; when Christianity and physical science will shake hands; and when all will be perfect peace between theology and Evolution on the subject of the brotherhood of men;—in fact when all the sciences will unite to prove the unity of the human race.

Two men of the same name, and from the same county in the north of England, were one day trying to find out if there were any relationship between them. For a long time it looked likely that they would succeed in proving a relationship. But toward the close of the genealogical table, as far as they could trace it, the evidence broke down. Certain essential links were missing and could not be supplied. So the north countrymen had to give up the task in despair, and to part with mutual goodwill. It is much like this in the theory of Evolution. For a long time it appears that the scientist will make good his case. But suddenly the evidence completely breaks down. He cannot find the missing links between man and the monkey. Till he does, and shows us that there are no left-out elements in the solution of the problem he has set himself to solve, but that his theory completely

covers the whole facts in relation to man, he must not be angry with us if we complain that the evidence does not altogether command our faith.

We can hardly be expected to believe in evidence as yet marvellously incomplete. It surely is rational to suspend faith till the case is clearly made out and fully established. And if, in the end, Evolution turn out to be correct, it will not interfere with our Christian beliefs, because we have "received a kingdom which cannot be moved." The foundation-principles of the Christian religion are immutable; soul and conscience, redemption and immortality, are put beyond the reach of Evolution. If ever the theory of Evolution be proved beyond all reasonable doubt it may simply become necessary, in that case, to regard the opening of the Book of Genesis as a vision afforded man of what God intends to make the race; though we may have to say long enough, "We see not yet all things put under Him," as did the early Christians. If men were formed at first according to the development theory, it would simply come to this—God made man but made him by a different process from that hitherto received by the Churches; still He would be the Creator, Preserver, Governor, Redeemer, and Judge of the race. We do not say this will be the ultimate solution of the difficulty, nor is it needful as yet even to consider it.

Dr. Elam, in *The Contemporary Review*, May, 1880, in an able article on "The Gospel of Evolution," says: "It cannot be too clearly stated and understood that we know *nothing* of the occurrence, in nature, of any variation that has succeeded, or can succeed, in giving its possessor an

advantage in the supposed 'struggle for life.'" And so he rejects the theory of the origin of species by natural selection. "Natural Selection," he continues, further, "is merely an euphuism for a negation—a happy phrase for something that has no existence. In itself it is *nothing;* in its application to the explanation of development of structure and function, it is full of irreconcilable contradictions and incoherencies." He says, again: "It is always insisted on that Natural Selection only acts by preserving and perpetuating very minute variations, of such a character as will enable their possessor to contend more vigorously and successfully in the struggle for life. The idea is pretty in theory; but when we attempt its application, it fails utterly." Dr. Elam gives a pertinent illustration: "We cannot conceive that a minute pimple on the nose could give 'an advantage' in the struggle for life; yet, if there be any truth in the doctrine now under discussion, such must have been the origin of the terrible weapon of the sword-fish." He asserts, further, that "Such organs as the eye and the internal ear are quite out of the reach of any explanation by Natural Selection." Even Mr. Darwin frankly says: "To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivance for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by Natural Selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree." Dr. Elam adds: "Yet, having said so much, he makes the attempt to explain its origin—and fails. The reason is obvious—it *cannot* be explained; because, owing to the development of the

eye being due to simultaneous growth of parts from within and from without, the organ itself would be absolutely useless until it had attained such a degree of development as to admit of these separate parts meeting; and so the principle of preserving any *useful* variety would again be quite inapplicable. The same, with modifications, may be said concerning the internal ear; but Mr. Darwin, with great judgment, makes no allusion to this subject: at least, not in any edition that I have seen." As to the doctrine of Evolution, Dr. Elam maintains that "It cannot be decided on one side or the other by authoritative assertion, by felicitous phrasing, or by refusal to entertain any but one-sided views. *Evidence*, and evidence alone, must be our guide to acceptance or rejection; and where, from the nature of the case, direct evidence is unattainable, we must make our choice in accordance with neither superstition nor prejudice, but in accordance with rational probabilities and scientific analogies." Going from the region of poetry and the domain of quasi-science, Dr. Elam states: "The first most obvious consideration that strikes us, in entering upon the inquiry, is this, that all that we *know with any certainty* concerning organic beings, lends no support to any hypothesis of Evolution. History, observation, and experiment, alike, proclaim the absolute constancy of specific forms—varying, no doubt, in secondary and non-essential characters to even an indefinite extent, but never passing the limits of the *species;* species being generally understood, in this argument, to imply a group of animals producing offspring continuously fertile, *inter se*, and with the parent stock. This is absolute and without exception. No one instance is known of the

variation here implied. Species A invariably produces species A, and even though it may be A, or A_2, or A_3—or even A_n—each of these, to the end of the chapter, presents the physiological characters of the parent A, and at no stage is there observable any modification of the original mutual fertility." Coming to the consideration of Evolution in relation to man, Dr. Elam says: "Morphology gives some qualified support; Embryology, fairly considered, renders it very improbable; the science of Man demonstrates it to be impossible." He further adds: "It is supremely improbable that man, the most helpless, and the longest helpless, of all animals, should be descended, in accordance with any rational theory of *progressive* development, from any of the brute creation." And still further: "It is improbable in the extreme that a walking animal should descend from a climbing animal" (here borrowing from M. Quatrefages); "so improbable that it has appeared to many, even of those who hold the doctrine of Evolution, as a fatal bar to the ape theory, and they have attempted to trace out some other brute origin for man."

But when we come to the essential characteristics of man, intellectually and spiritually, as we have already seen, the impossibility of Evolution appears to us absolutely demonstrated. This point we had reached and sketched before meeting with Dr. Elam's views. We were glad that so able a writer confirmed impressions partly published ten years ago, and amplified for the present edition.

The article we have so largely quoted from, concludes with an old syllogism :—

"Without *verification*, a theoretic conception is a mere figment of the intellect."

"The theory of Organic Evolution is an unverified theoretic conception.

"Therefore, ORGANIC EVOLUTION IS A MERE FIGMENT OF THE INTELLECT."

Evolution is the god of some scientists. It has all love, and all wisdom, and all power. There is, in fact, nothing in nature or in society which Evolution cannot do. It manages the origin of species by natural selection, being, as it seems, a most intelligent agent, and so selecting its instruments with the most delicate judgment. It creates or develops new species in the animal kingdom with wonderful skill and ease; and though there are here and there great gaps, this is a trifle not to be thought of, as an advanced thinker in Evolution can put it all right with a stroke of his pen, and so show where Evolution either actually did or else meant to work effectually. It also manages human affairs with equal ability and good judgment, presiding over the destinies of individuals, families, and communities; and the evolution of society is a fact not to be contradicted or set aside, except under the pain of being voted an ignoramus of no ordinary stupidity. Really, we are led to ask ourselves, what is this wonderful something called Evolution? Is it a personal thing, or an impersonal thing: or is it a new form of Pantheism, or is it something that common people cannot get at and examine? Or is it, again, an easy and convenient method of quietly shutting God out of the world? We have an old-fashioned notion that the world cannot do without the God of the Bible; a

personal, intelligent, loving God; a God with a will, a God of strong power, and a God of boundless wisdom and goodness. If where some scientists place Evolution we put a personal God, the whole work of nature and providence is accomplished, but in an infinitely better and more intelligent way. And if the student of nature says that from the book of nature he gets the most convincing evidence of Evolution—evidence which he cannot gainsay or set aside—let him not therefore make a god of Evolution, as if Evolution were the first and final cause of all things, and the acceptance of Pantheism the only rational way out of the difficulty. If the God of the Bible has worked by Evolution, and we have so far been simply mistaken as to His method of working, that is another and very different matter: though this much, at present, as the Scotch put it, is by no means proven.

What is the conclusion we have reached? If Evolution is held to mean that the Almighty is not the Creator of the world, and if unchangeable laws mean in the lips of scientists that the Almighty is not the Governor of the world, then many thoughtful Christians will feel compelled to abandon science. But if there be a middle path between the extreme theories of some scientists who see little or no truth in Christianity, and some theologians who see little or no truth in science, then we think Christians may safely walk in that middle path, holding by the great facts of the Bible and by the great facts of science. Well-attested scientific facts we may and ought to receive, and the well-established facts of the written revelation too. These, as we understand them, are not

mutually exclusive and destructive. We may be Christians, and men of science too; and we may be all the better men of science for being Christians. If science wants to blot out God as the Creator and Governor of the world, and wants to disprove Christianity and to deny man's spiritual nature, then it is science gone morally mad; but if it takes in all the facts, it is found at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in its right mind.

CHAPTER III.

NATURAL LESSONS.

CHRISTIAN Sociology takes in the whole of man's material interests and physical circumstances. All that concerns humanity, all that promotes the physical welfare of our fellows, all that elevates and improves the life that now is—Christianity embraces in its sociological principles and enactments. And it is prudent on the part of philanthropists and Church-workers to care more than ever for the improvement of the conditions under which the masses of the people live. To do this is the shortest path to spiritual success in very many instances. We have too long ignored this fact. We have neglected the homes of the people, neglected sanitary improvement, neglected their physical well-being. We have cared for their souls and not for their bodies. The result is our spiritual work has frequently failed. The circumstances and surroundings of the people were too strong for the feeble spiritual ideas and aspirations we succeeded in planting in their mind. We must lessen temptation; we must furnish healthy conditions of life, naturally, socially, and morally. We must teach the sacredness of human life, aid people in honestly supplying their physical wants, guard them as far as possible against excessive physical labour, promote as far as we can the public health by every prudent arrangement, improve by all the means in our power the

dwellings of the poor, and never weary in this work or look at it as if it were some unnecessary addition to spiritual Christianity. We hold that this is an essential part of Christianity, and a part sadly too long neglected. We have been working our Christianity under the most unfavourable conditions, in fact too commonly ignoring conditions altogether and trusting simply to spiritual forces. Now this might do well enough if man had no body,—but he has one. And Christ in His work properly recognised man's physical nature. The sooner the Church of the age comes back to New Testament principles and methods, the better for the Church and the better for the world also.

So far we have endeavoured to establish the natural brotherhood of men, always holding by the teaching of the Bible where science came into direct collision with it, feeling that no other course is open to us till science has had a longer day for toil and is better understood. And all through these pages we purpose adopting the same method as to political science, so far as it may be found necessary to deal with it. Statesmen and political economists may depart from the teaching of Scripture, and sometimes laugh at the old-fashioned ideas of the Bible; but the grand old Book has done more to strengthen governments and to give vitality to nations, than all the teachings of the most gifted and patriotic philosophers. We distinctly remember how the *Times* newspaper, in one of its leading articles, contemptuously sneered at the "flesh and blood argument" employed by Mr. Gladstone in one of his speeches during the debate on the Reform Bill in the House of Commons. We thought if God had given us a clever son we would at least teach him three

things;—to love Christianity, to hate the devil, and to doubt the *Times* newspaper—a paper without fixed principles, going with the times, changing with the change of government, and bending to public taste and opinion. Now this we hold to be demoralising. Its effect is to teach the people laxity of principle, to adopt a loose policy, and to value success more than righteousness. Its influence is given to the side of moral weakness and indifference; its tendency is to make people anything or nothing, so as to keep with the popular tide of feeling and opinion; and it creates a character as "unstable as water" for the sake of being on the winning side. For a great national newspaper,—that may have occasionally done splendid national service,—to set such a national example of fickleness of principle we regard as a national misfortune. It is worse than the creed of Cain to sneer at "the flesh and blood argument," for he did most frankly acknowledge brotherhood with righteous Abel, and appeared never to think of denying it, while he wickedly ignored all responsibility arising out of it. The brotherhood was fully admitted, but the duties growing out of it were denied. Some sceptical men and public prints in these times reverse the process,—they deny the brotherhood, and in that way endeavour to get rid of the responsibility. This is only another method of reaching the position Cain took up in relation to Abel and to God. Divine and human claims are completely ignored by the adoption of either plan.

Naturally then there is a blood relationship everywhere. All the world over man stands related to his fellow-man. And were men disposed to deny this fact they would

have something more to do than simply ignore the inspiration and authority of Scripture. All nature and experience supply proof and illustration of human brotherhood. Let the laws of nature be transgressed, and man does not suffer alone. Other people are involved in the suffering; the sad effect of man's sinful procedure is painfully felt by his fellows. In numerous ways this truth is seen and acknowledged. If man violate the laws of health, disease is very frequently generated and spread. Ay, and when all else fails to draw forth from some people an acknowledgment of human brotherhood, a frank confession that all persons possess a nature in common;—the spread of fever or cholera or some other infectious disease through a whole town or district or nation, conclusively demonstrates the relationship of man to man. Neglect your brother man, or deny that he is your brother, and disease itself will compel you to consider his claims and to own your kinship. Truth cannot be killed by loud and repeated denial, or by your refusing to accept it. And the truth of human brotherhood will live like all other truth, though for a time it may be disowned, concealed or trampled upon, and its beneficial operation hindered. But facts are still facts in spite of long and strong denial. Yes, and they have a marvellous life in them which sustains them age after age, and a manifold method of establishing themselves as generations come and go. The Americans formerly asserted that the negroes they held in slavery were not men with the souls and rights of brothers. The falsehood passed for a time; but the heartless libel was not forgotten by a righteous God, and the logic of events—the slow but sure logic of Divine Providence—at length

demonstrated the truth of the ignored brotherhood. By a terrible civil war, justly chastising the English for partaking in the gains of slave-grown cotton as well as the Americans, the denied fact of brotherhood was triumphantly vindicated.

Considering then man simply as a human being, and not to go at present beyond his physical nature, we are really and truly our brother's keeper, responsible for the influence we exercise over him, and for the whole of our conduct towards him. His natural interests are largely placed in our hands, and we are bound by virtue of our natural relation to him to care for his natural life and physical well-being. We cannot act as we please or do what we will with our own, provided our actions inflict deliberate injury upon others. It is a duty we owe to man as man, not in any way to damage his life or health or temporal interests; but lovingly to take all of them under our perpetual guardianship. And in case we refuse this benevolent office of nature, then the voice of our brother's blood will cry to God against us, and we shall ultimately be dealt with in proportion to the magnitude and aggravated character of our guilt.

Human brotherhood teaches *the sacredness of natural life*. It is sacred in God's eyes and ought to be so in ours. It is given for high and holy purposes, to be spent for the glory of God, the good of society and in preparation for the lofty life of immortality. As it is therefore intended to glorify God and benefit man as long as its great Author sees fit to continue it, no mortal has any kind of right whatever to abridge it. Abruptly to terminate life, or in any way to cut it shorter than God designed, is a sinful

interference with the crown-rights of Jehovah. The great Giver of life is absolute sovereign over it; and as the issue and outcome of human life to the individual is important beyond conception and expression, it implies fearful guilt to waylay and assassinate our brother man, suddenly sending him into an unchanging eternity. Considering the importance of human life in itself and in its relation to society, to the family, the nation, the Church, and the world; and especially when considered in its relation to the everlasting future, standing as we do on the shore of the unbounded sea of human existence, and looking at human beings as linked at once with heaven and earth, —we say the wilful and deliberate destruction of human life, so fraught with momentous issues and interests, is seen to be one of the blackest of human crimes. So sacred is human life in God's estimation that He has thrown around it the special protection of Divine law. On His sovereign authority He declared, under the Patriarchal Dispensation, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. ix. 6). However it is not enough that we refrain from taking away the life of our fellow-man by some terrible act of violence. Human brotherhood rightly understood puts us under obligation to abstain from inflicting physical injury in any way whatever. Violence and bloodshed are no doubt very horrible crimes. But let us remember that there are many ways in which we may murder our fellows. It is not always necessary to employ some deadly weapon for this purpose. It may be done with a refinement of cruelty, more slowly we grant but quite as effectually, by close confinement,

excessive labour, insufficient food, want of proper clothing, badly ventilated workshops and dwelling-houses, and the neglect of necessary sanitary improvements. We mean that these may separately or in combination destroy human life. The constitution of the strongest even may be gradually undermined, the health at length may wholly give way, and the once vigorous man may find a premature grave. Not therefore to attend to matters contributing to the physical well-being of our fellows, implies a high degree of criminal culpability. If we do not prevent the destruction of human life when we might we are consenting parties, accessory to the event, or deliberate promoters of the murder of men. So blinded are men by selfishness and sin that they frequently act, in carrying out their business and domestic arrangements, as if no human beings had any rights and interests but themselves. Surely this state of things cannot always last. It ought not and will not, as sure as there is a God of right in heaven. There must and will be an end to all reckless and inhuman trampling upon the natural good, the life and health and comfort of others.

As to the question of *capital punishment* it does appear that it is destined to pass away before the growing intelligence and Christian feeling of modern times. Formerly persons were hung for forgery, for horse stealing, for sheep stealing, for burglary, for coining, and for stealing from a shop to the value of five shillings. That has all passed away now, and the property of people is quite as safe or safer than it was formerly when capital punishment was inflicted for these crimes. In no passage in the New Testament that we remember is there anything like the re-enactment of

the law of the Old Testament, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed." We live under a dispensation of greater mercy and greater enlightenment. At the annual public debate of the College Debating Society of the London University, Mr. John Bright presided, in June 1880, and said some excellent and weighty things on this subject. "It has always seemed to me that the infliction of capital punishment was a policy as unchristian as it seemed to me unphilosophical, a policy that was likely to fail; and, as far as I have been able to judge from the experience of other countries and of this, it is a policy that has entirely failed. It seemed to me that to teach people the sacredness of human life—which is, after all, the great safeguard of human life—there could be no plan more opposed to the maintenance of that safeguard than the ordinary and frequent sacrifice of human life by the law; that if it is expected that individuals are to reverence human life the country and its law should reverence it as much, and that the one will depend very much upon the other. I believe that, however much law may deter and may make life safe, the reverence which is implanted in the mind in favour of human life is infinitely more powerful as a safeguard than any, even the severest, punishment the law can inflict; and when the punishment which the law inflicts is one which shows that human life may, under certain circumstances, be treated in a barbarous, a savage, and degrading manner, that tends to undermine and upset the great reverence for human life which is among men, in all civilised and Christian countries, the principal safeguard of it. Now in this country we have been very backward in this matter.

We are at present more backward than any other civilised Christian country in the world. Many persons in this country, convicted offenders against the law, are put to death, who, if convicted in any other country, would not be put to death; and that is a very serious and unpleasant thing to say and admission to make of our own country, which we would wish to be at least on a par with the very highest and most civilised countries of the globe. I am more glad than I can tell you that you are to discuss this question, as I hope that you will make yourselves thoroughly acquainted with it, so that hereafter you may come to swell that public opinion which I doubt not will ere long be formed, and which will ask Parliament—nay, which will compel Parliament—to adopt a milder code, and so at last bring our practice more in accordance with our principles and more in accordance with the practice of some dozen other civilised nations of the globe. If capital punishments are not necessary in many American States, if they are not necessary in Italy, if they are not necessary in Portugal or Germany, if they are not necessary in Belgium and Holland, they cannot be necessary for us; and if human life is sufficiently guarded in those countries—and, so far as I know, there is no complaint that it is not so guarded with the absence of this barbarous code, there is nothing in the conditions of existence in this country which ought to make it impossible to abolish capital punishment here. Now, there is another point, and that is the strange and terrible inequality of the punishment. If you will do as I have done, watch the cases of murder which are tried in the country, you will find that they differ from each other as much as any

two crimes can differ. There are the murders through sudden passion, murders through jealousy and drink, through excitement and street broils, and which are committed by persons on the very verge of insanity, and then there is the murder deliberated and long calculated, done with systematic intent, and which makes you wonder at the kind of man who has been guilty of it, and yet your law gives exactly the same punishment in all these cases. I cannot conceive anything more horrible than that punishment when it was carried out outside Newgate, with 5,000 people looking on. It had then some kind of recommendation in its favour. It cannot stand against facts, it is true; the facts were terribly stronger than the argument. But now, what is done? In the place of these public executions, which are supposed to overawe the roughs of the neighbourhood, and to impress the minds of decent people with the propriety of bringing up their children well that they may avoid so great a catastrophe, you have now the governor of the gaol, the sheriff, the under-sheriff, the clergyman or the minister of the Gospel, with half a dozen policemen, who, I will not say, are hardened to their work—they are all hardened to their work. During the sittings of that Commission, to which reference has been made in the course of this debate, we had before us the Ordinary of Newgate, not the gentleman who fills that office now, but I think it was his predecessor. I asked him what effect these executions had upon him. He said when he first attended an execution it was something terrible to him, and it made him ill. I cannot remember his exact words, but they were something to that effect. I asked him how many

executions he had been to, and I forget how many he said, but I think it was eighteen or twenty, or some such number; and he told me that, though the effect of the first execution upon him was as he described, the next time the effect was much less, and afterwards it was a mere ordinary affair, which had no effect upon him whatever. If it can have that effect upon a Christian minister, it must have a very hardening effect upon the sheriff, the governor, and the policemen in whose presence this act is performed. What is done? The wretched man is taken out of his cell, pinioned; and the man who, in better times, will be an unknown animal in this country, the last executioner of the law, comes then and puts the rope about his neck, discussing with him the question of the drop. He treats it as a matter of business, and he is as unconcerned as the butcher cutting up his sheep. All this is done, but the public do not see it; the newspapers do not see it. Even the reporters are not allowed to see it. In winter, almost in darkness, our fellow-men, criminals though they be, may be put to death in this secret, this silent, and this horrible fashion."

How many times the wrong person has been hanged it is impossible to say. Innocent persons have sometimes been dangerously near the gallows. Habron was condemned for the Whalley Range murder, Manchester; but there was so much feeling of danger and injustice in the public mind of Manchester, that the Home Secretary found it imposible to carry out the sentence. First the poor fellow was reprieved; within two years it was proved to the complete satisfaction of everybody concerned that he was perfectly innocent of the crime laid to his charge, and

he was therefore liberated and compensated by the Government. Would it not be far better to confine murderers for the term of their natural life than to hang them, and so, while depriving them of the liberty which they have justly forfeited, not deprive them of the time and opportunity of seeking God's forgiving mercy, and grace to live before Him in all well-pleasing, illustrating the sincerity of their repentance and the reality of their regeneration? The fact is clear enough that God allowed the first murderer to live. Cain was not immediately put to death. And though the punishment inflicted on him was heavy, yet the punishment was not unmixed with mercy. The Lord spared him and protected his life from the hand of the slayer everywhere. How much more ought this to be the spirit and the conduct of Christians in these latter and more glorious days of grace and truth? To adopt a policy of this kind appears to possess every advantage without the fearful risk of committing a greater crime, in some instances greater than that for which the man is executed.

Human brotherhood, in its natural aspects, teaches *that man's physical wants should be properly supplied.* It is a burning shame that multitudes are compelled to go without proper food and clothing. There is enough and to spare in the country, and yet large numbers of human beings are daily living in a state of comparative destitution. It is by no fault of theirs in many instances that they are placed in these circumstances. We are not speaking of those who earn large wages, and might comfortably get on if they only were steady and economical, but of a large class who never have the chance of doing well. It is a blot upon Christian civilisation throughout Chris-

tendom—but especially in Britain—that such a state of things is allowed to continue both by the Government and the Churches. The children of many a good hard-working man cry for bread when he has little or none to give them. The father of a large family in many cases does not and cannot earn enough to meet the barest possible need of his offspring, however thrifty the housewife may be. Many a farm labourer with a delicate wife and large family, and only receiving some twelve or fifteen shillings a week, has a fearful strain put upon his virtue. We positively care more for our prisoners than for many deep down in honest poverty. We feed and pamper our criminal class, while undergoing imprisonment, and supply them with far better food and clothing and house accommodation than is put within the possible reach of multitudes of virtuous and industrious people. Many mill-hands of various descriptions earn as little as many farm servants, and consequently find it a difficult thing to make ends meet, especially if blest with a numerous progeny. The unavoidable hardships of many of the most worthy of our working population render it impossible for us to look on with cold blood, while they struggle on amid hunger, poverty and dirt, with the bitter exclamation frequently wrung from their lips:—

> "O God! that bread should be so dear,
> And flesh and blood so cheap."

What if it should turn out (as Professor Goldwin Smith intimates somewhere in his lecture on Pym) that in this age and nation wealth is too much accumulated and too little diffused? Perhaps it is thought that the

Churches would exert themselves, and largely make up for the guilty shortcomings of the Government; but, no. The professors of Christianity do not live their religion —do not half live it. The infidels of the age justly complain that Christianity has done little for the temporal interests of the people. Lord Byron said he saw little Christian charity in the world, and dated his first impressions against Christianity from this very fact. We mournfully acknowledge that the disciples of Jesus have not faithfully carried out the principle of universal beneficence. Too commonly they have had one set of convictions to believe in, and another set of convictions to live by. They have too frequently said to a brother or sister, naked and destitute of daily food, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled," notwithstanding they have not given the parties those things that were needful. (James ii. 15, 16.) But we have yet to learn that infidelity is entitled to charge cold neglect on Christians alone, or that infidelity can boast of any superiority on this ground. Would the world have gained anything in this respect if infidelity had been universal and Christianity never heard of? We decidedly think not. The author of *Ecce Homo* admits that Christianity has only failed as society has failed; and, while he bitterly laments the failure, we suppose he would no more think of destroying Christianity because of its failures, than of breaking up society because we still need prisons and require a strong police force. Yet look at the matter as we may—apologise and excuse to the utmost—the awkward fact stands out in broad daylight,—society and Churches have coldly and cruelly trampled upon the

doctrine of human brotherhood. Christian charity itself in these times dies of excessive caution. It is becoming too prudent, too worldly-wise, too cold and calculating to live a vigorous and healthy life; it is killed by a superfluity of earthly wisdom. An inconsiderate and unthinking charity is not beneficial, as it weakens human character, cultivates and encourages a feeling of dependence; in fact completely pauperises the people, and is therefore by no means to be commended. But push caution in this particular to an extreme and it becomes criminal. Probably if the Church of the age had cared more than it has for the material wants of man, it would have been a great deal better for the spread of Christianity. To care for the natural interests of humanity is only to follow the example of Christ. He did temporal good on a large scale; and how can we reasonably hope for the rapid extension of His religion unless in this particular we tread in His steps? A good deal of work must be done in this direction to prepare the way of the Lord, and to make straight in this desert-world a highway for our God. We know it is easy to point out evils and to wax eloquent in condemning wrong; but it is another and very different thing to suggest a remedy, or clearly to indicate a way out of existing difficulties. But surely the consideration that the peasant is brother to the peer, that the poor and rich have the same blood running in their veins, that all really belong to the same family, should give birth to a broad and practical sympathy causing an active flow of benevolence to ameliorate the social system, effectually relieving the distressed, and doing it without pauperising and degrading them as if they belonged to an inferior race of

beings. In ages gone by God said to His own people especially, yet at the same time the language emphatically applies both to the Jewish Government and to government in this age and nation: "Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isaiah i. 17). Governments and Churches must rectify what is wrong, change and improve what is corrupt. With the action of government as such, we may deal by-and-by; but the Church of Christ ought to become a philanthropic Church, and to make the cause of suffering humanity peculiarly her own. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (James i. 27). But while these extreme links in the chain of suffering humanity are reached, each intermediate link must be carefully attended to. All in necessitous circumstances must share in our sympathy and benevolence; and unless we show them that we care for the body it is difficult to persuade them that we care for their souls. Have not too many good Christian people looked upon religion as if it were exclusively meant by God for the soul, as if it had no sort of relation whatever to the human body? Hence the long and unnatural divorce between secular and sacred things. Man has natural as well as spiritual wants, and as he must live here before he lives hereafter his physical necessities must be fully taken into account. And yet how appalling in the nineteenth century of Christianity are the facts brought out by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the agricultural employment of women and children in England. One woman said: "We don't have

a bit of butcher's meat not for half a year, not from Christmas to Christmas. We sometimes get a bit of mutton at 3d. a pound, when a *giddy sheep* is killed on the farm, and sometimes we buy a bit at Christmas. We live on potatoes, bread, and pig-meat, and are very thankful if we can get a bit of pig-meat; we often sit down to dry bread. For harvest dinner we send out boiled potatoes, a bit of cabbage, and we put a bit of fat to the potatoes; we never have a drop of milk." Think of hundreds of our fellow-creatures, human beings of the same flesh and blood, so shamefully ill-fed, with clothing of the poorest description, and their bed in some cases only covered with a single blanket; with house accommodation awfully deficient; and then go and eat your meals in peace and sleep comfortably in your downy beds if you can! Had our authority not been Her Majesty's Commissioners we might have supposed the cases greatly exaggerated, but there is no room left for doubt now; and to our certain knowledge there is a depth of misery and wretchedness where Commissioners have never yet been sent, and where respectable people seldom or never visit, in many of the courts and back streets of our large towns and cities, which would make any feeling heart bleed in an age and nation like this. Orphans and widows with one meagre meal a day—thin, wan, and weak; fathers going to a hard day's work with an empty stomach, and a keen pain at their heart because of their hungry little ones at home; and in thousands of instances these not your idle, wasteful, unprincipled men who never think, scheme and struggle, but decent men, with heads and hearts, with a life-and-death tenacity striving bravely to keep body and

soul together, and yet finding it utterly impossible to bear up. Talk of heroes on the battle-field! It is an easy thing to go in the heat of the fight to dare and to die in the company of ten thousand men, but an infinitely harder thing to struggle on in solitary life almost abandoned to despair! May God help these heroes in humble life, toiling and enduring, unnoticed and unknown, and give them courage and grace a little longer, that they may win a better home than they find in our midst on earth! And may the Great Father in heaven show us the hollowness of our boasting with reference to our poor-laws, our philanthropy, and our Christian sympathy, unless we do something to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. Rather we have deep need to kneel low at the feet of God, and to ask His forgiveness for practically disowning our brother in ten thousand transparent acts palpable to heaven and earth, denying in the strongest possible way that we are our brother's keeper.

The brotherhood of men further teaches that we should, *as far as possible, protect our fellow-men against all excessive physical labour.* We are aware that the mental labour of men is becoming quite as excessive, unreasonable, and injurious, as the physical labour of the multitude who work with their hands. Men of letters, statesmen, and ministers of the Gospel, have far longer hours and more exhausting toil than those who are doomed to mere physical labour. Then in busy seasons the masters as well as the men are sometimes fearfully overworked, especially in some kinds of trade. This is not as it ought to be; not we think as God willed and arranged that His creatures should live and act. It is not absolutely

necessary or the Divine ordination, but for the most part occasioned by the sin or greed or ambition of men. God never planned society to go on according to the present state of things. Men themselves, by their folly and evil, have made the social world the world it is. The hours of labour in most cases are not what they used to be. Before the Ten Hours Bill,—the Factory Act of the Earl of Shaftesbury—then Lord Ashley,—came into operation boys and girls were often cruelly compelled to work from five in the morning till nine at night, with a very short time allowed to swallow their meals. For grown-up people of both sexes the hours in mills are still unreasonably long at certain seasons. The masters may tell us they cannot complete orders unless the mill-hands make overtime. Well, it is for gentlemen to decide, with the conscience and intelligence they possess, whether their profits shall be a trifle less upon the year or the constitutions of their workpeople shall seriously suffer. Shopmen as well as factory-hands are doomed frequently to make unreasonably long hours. Early Closing Associations have done much in many towns to shorten the hours of labour. Still, however, a poor weak exhausted lad has to stand fourteen or fifteen hours behind the counter in too many instances; and when the shop closes let not the uninitiated public readily conclude that all work for the tired youth is done. The grocer has often to prepare his groceries for festive occasions, and the draper to pack up and put by the goods disarranged by serving the customers. If humane ladies would only remember that many a youth in his teens—growing fast and sadly needing a little fresh air—is frequently prevented taking the walk he has planned by

their slipping into the shop several minutes before closing time, we are sure such ladies would contrive to do their business a little earlier in the day. Domestic servants in some families are sadly overworked. There is no sort of conscience on the part of the lady of the house. Party after party is invited; the poor girls are up late and early week after week, until at length their health gives way, and then they are cast upon the care of aged or needy parents, or sent to die in the workhouse. And perhaps if you were to enter into conversation for five minutes with the fashionable ladies in question, they would pour into your ear the most heartrending lamentations over the sad degeneracy of modern domestic servants. Could they or their children taste the drudgery of those who serve at their table for one short year, it would no doubt open their eyes. Let it not be understood from what has been said that we pity people simply because they have to work; the reverse is really the case. We hold that work is a necessity of the state, and a blessing to society. That in fact men are far happier working than killing time. Work is the appointment of God. It is only on behalf of the really overworked that we lift up our feeble voice of entreaty and expostulation. Domestic servants are often looked upon and treated as if they belonged to another species, and were not made of human flesh and blood. Workmen and apprentices are sometimes regarded as if they were inferior animals. In fact, dogs and cattle frequently fare better than human beings. Many masters will open their eyes in blank amazement when the Judge of all the earth tells them the light in which He looks at their conduct

toward their dependents. Let no one conclude that we are defending the idle, worthless, and insubordinate. We have not penned one word of sympathy for such throughout these pages. But all kinds of slavery and tyranny make our blood boil by whatever name they may be called. It is the injured, oppressed, and down-trodden among men that we feel for, and who in so many cases are unable to plead their own cause, but suffer silently from year to year. No man has any kind of right, whatever position he may occupy in society, to trample upon his fellows and damage their natural interests. The natural rights of the poorest as well as the richest are rendered sacred by Divine law, and ought therefore to be profoundly respected. God has taken especial care to be clear on this point. On behalf of suffering and oppressed humanity He has spoken out repeatedly and strongly. When the Israelites in Egypt were cruelly trampled under foot by their taskmasters, and all nature was wronged and outraged, God expressed His deep sympathy with them to Moses at the burning bush, and wrought a miracle to deliver them from the bondage and tyranny of Pharaoh. "I have surely seen the affliction of My people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large." I have seen with ever-wakeful eye and sympathetic heart the affliction of My people which are in Egypt; I have heard their cry of anguish and helpless despondency; and I am Myself come down to deliver. And God not only pities

a nation of slaves, but every solitary sufferer in society. All kinds of natural wrong; everything that injuriously interferes with the temporal well-being of our brother man is deeply offensive to God, and a palpable violation of the just and humane teaching of Jesus. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matthew vii. 12). This is a golden rule of easy apprehension and application in all the relations of life. With reference to the question of excessive labour, it is only right to be remember that the nine hours system is being introduced into most trades now. Physical labour ought to be as reasonable as it can be made consistently with the true interests of trade. But let working men beware of introducing violent changes, as these are far from benefiting operatives ultimately. A man has certainly a right to take his labour to the best market; but the point is this—what will be his best market not for a few months, or for a year or two, but permanently? Another point carefully to be considered is, what is the best method of accomplishing what is in itself right and reasonable? For a right thing may be done in a wrong way.

Human brotherhood teaches *that the health of the public should be promoted by every possible arrangement.* How is it possible to keep up the health of the people, and to prevent the physical deterioration especially of our great centres of population, with bad sanitary arrangements, and bad ventilation, and the fearful adulteration of food? Here is the first case to hand, among a number of others; and if this may be taken as a fair sample of what is going on in our great towns, the wonder is,

not the physical deterioration of the people, but how they live at all. The case we give occurred in Salford, Lancashire, 1880:

"The following report from the public analyst of the borough, Mr. J. Carter Bell: During the quarter ended September 30, 1880, I have examined one hundred and fifty-four samples, consisting of fifty-two milks, forty-nine breads, two flours, three oatcakes, two butters, seventeen teas, five coffees, three peppers, four sugars, eleven wines, one baker's mixture, and five waters. Of these, twenty-four were adulterated, consisting of nine milks, nine wines, five breads, and one butter. The five breads contained a chemical compound which is known by the name of baker's mixture. This is now being sold in Salford to bakers for the purpose of mixing with inferior flour. It is made from phosphates of alumina, lime, and magnesia, with sulphuric acid and hydrochloric acid, and I have found that it has the effect of spoiling the bread, and making it injurious to health. It also contained a considerable amount of arsenic, the consequence of its being made from impure materials. I need not say how dangerous it is to introduce such a mixture into bread. I have also examined nine samples of so-called unfermented wines, and two of ordinary tent wines. Of these nine samples, three, bearing labels stating that the bottles contained 'pure grape juice,' 'virgin fruit of the vine,' &c., consisted of sugar, tartaric acid, salycylic acid, and colouring matter, with a considerable quantity of copper, the result, doubtless, of ignorant or careless manufacture. Grape juice was, in my opinion, entirely absent. Another sample, labelled 'Pure and genuine unfermented fruit of the

vine,' was evidently a composite article artificially made and so carelessly prepared as to contain alcohol. One sample of unfermented wine imported from abroad contained some grape juice, but the presence of alcohol and an abundance of yeast cells showed that fermentation had not been arrested. One sample was labelled 'The selected wine of the Temperance Fraternity.' This was an ordinary low-class fermented wine containing a large amount of alcohol. Of the nine samples of so-called unfermented wines only one was genuine, and was what it professed to be, 'Pure grape juice entirely free from alcohol.' The samples of tent were sweet and highly-alcoholic wines, one sample containing as much as 40 per cent. of proof spirit. This wine had evidently been strongly brandied, no natural wine containing anything like this proportion of alcohol. The number and variety of these so-called unfermented wines testified to a large demand for articles of this class, and my examinations point to the necessity of a very careful discretion in their selection. Three samples of water taken from the lodge of a manufactory were so highly contaminated with sewage matter as to make them dangerous to health."

There is an undoubted connection between bad sanitary arrangements and ill-health. The sewage of large towns pollutes the rivers of our country, and only those who have lived beside such rivers in hot dry summers can form any adequate idea of the sickening smells almost suffocating the people, many of whom are compelled in such seasons to drink the poisoned water of the filthy river. Is it to be wondered at that fever and diarrhœa flourish in such places? By utilising the sewage millions of money

might be saved to the country; the richest manure cast recklessly into the sea would be made to enrich the soil, and towns might convert into a profit what is now a terrible nuisance as well as a fearful source of expense. And thus along the course of the polluted rivers the inhabitants of small towns and villages would be saved, in many cases, from consuming unfit water, as they have so often been obliged to do when the wells have got exhausted—as we are able to testify from personal observation.

Something ought to be done to improve the sanitary condition of villages as well as towns and cities. The ideas and habits of the people must be elevated. "Cleanliness is next to godliness," says an old and important proverb, attributed to John Wesley. Might it not be as truly said that dirt is next to ungodliness? In towns the scavengers take away the accumulations of filth; in the village it has to be removed by the overworked labourer, either before or after the work of the day. It is necessary to look into this matter for the sake of the towns as well as the villages, there being a regular influx of people from the country into the towns. Some effectual method of village sanitary supervision is essential, since so many villagers see no need of it, live on in perfect indifference about the thing, and are thereby effectually training their offspring to walk in their steps.

To engage in sanitary work is to do work of a most important and necessary kind; and some of the brightest and most successful workers in this department are women. Women's work indeed is comprehensive and manifold in the attempt being made to-day to raise the masses of

poor neglected people. In an able paper by Miss Hellier, the daughter of the Governor of Headingley College, in *The London Quarterly Review* for October, 1879, it is said: "Ladies have begun to use their best endeavours to give the poor practical instruction of a kind they have never hitherto received. They not only teach religion, but show how much it consists in the right fulfilment of every-day duties. Adding example to precept they show women how to cook, how to economise, and how to keep their houses and children clean and healthy. Their active influence is further given to all schemes for improving poor dwelling-houses and providing substitutes for the theatre, public-house, and dancing saloon."

There are many well-disposed people, and many who are truly Christian, who feel at first that they cannot very well engage in direct spiritual work, who might at least undertake some sanitary teaching and labour. This is really Christian work when rightly looked at and properly understood. It is Christian work of a very high order, and wonderfully assists direct spiritual aggression. There are many Christian ladies and gentlemen of means and leisure who ought to undertake work of this kind. James Hinton, a great thinker, a philanthropist and a Christian, especially expected much from women. He thought the mission of woman was to make us understand God's character and will, as well as Christian work, very much better than we do at present. And it really seems as if the hope of Mr. Hinton was being realised, in some measure at least, by certain Christian women showing us more truly what Christianity is, not only by nobler living but by greater self-sacrificing work.

The labours of the Ladies' Sanitary Association in London, and of ladies like Miss Octavia Hill and Miss Cotton, now Lady Hope, are in most marked advance of all that has been previously attempted by lady workers, both as to the degree and the quality of the work accomplished. They do not assume authority over the lower classes and work for the love of power, or the love of popularity, or the love of sectarianism, but to give instruction to the poor of a kind never hitherto communicated. They teach the worth of fresh air, the use of pure water, the value of good food, how to nurse the sick, how to preserve the health of mothers, how to clothe and manage a baby, the power of soap and water, and homely truths of every-day importance in every house. They secure the delivery of practical lectures on health, sanitary improvement, and domestic economy. They circulate cheap and well-written tracts on all these subjects. Day nurseries are opened, houses are cleaned, cleansing materials are lent, clothing clubs formed, and a company established for building suitable dwellings for the poor. The whole arrangements are most complete, embracing all kinds of work of a sanitary kind, and not omitting efforts to secure instruction for the young in physiology and the laws of health.

Miss Hill in her work on *The Homes of the London Poor* shows how important it is to get authority over the dwellings of the very poor; and then to bring into earnest co-operation several agencies working side by side in the same locality. She has wise reason at hand for such a policy. "That the spiritual elevation of a large class depended to a considerable extent on sanitary reform was, I considered, proved; but I was equally certain that sanitary improvement

itself depended upon educational work among grown-up people; that they must be urged to rouse themselves from the lethargy and indolent habits into which they have fallen, and freed from all that hinders them from doing so. I further believed that any lady who would help them to obtain things, the need of which they felt themselves, and would sympathise with them in their desire for such, would soon find them eager to learn her view of what was best for them; that, whether this was so or not, her duty was to keep alive their own best hopes and intentions, which come at rare intervals, but fade too often for want of encouragement. I desired to be in a condition to free a few poor people from the tyranny and influence of a low class of landlords and landladies; from the corrupting effect of continual forced communication with very degraded fellow-lodgers; from the heavy incubus of accumulated dirt; so that the never-dying hope which I find characteristic of the poor might have leave to spring, and with it such energy as might help them to help themselves." She further says, "In many of the houses the dust-bins were utterly unapproachable, and cabbage leaves, stale fish, and every sort of dirt were lying in the passages and on the stairs; in some, the back kitchen had been used as a dust-bin, but had not been emptied for years, and the dust filtered through into the front kitchens, which were the sole living and sleeping rooms of some families; in some, the kitchen stairs were many inches thick with dirt, which was so hardened that a shovel had to be used to get it off; in some, there was hardly any water to be had, the wood was eaten and broken away, windows were smashed, and the rain was

coming in through the roofs. . . . . The front doors stood open day and night; and as I felt my way down the kitchen stair, broken and rounded by the hardened mud upon them, the foul smells which the heavy foggy air would not allow to rise, met me as I descended, and the plaster rattled down with a hollow sound, as I groped along. . . . . Sometimes I had to open the kitchen door myself, after knocking several times in vain, when a woman quite drunk would be lying on the floor on some black mass which served as a bed; sometimes, in answer to my knocks, a half-drunken man would swear, and thrust the rent-money out to me through a chink of the door, placing his foot against it, so as to prevent it from opening wide enough to admit me. Always it would be shut again without a light being offered to guide me up the pitch dark stairs."

From Mr. Ruskin, Miss Hill got permission to purchase the lease of three houses in her own immediate neighbourhood for the sum of £750. In about a year and a half the scheme repaid forty-eight pounds of the capital, in addition to paying five per cent. interest on the entire amount, after deducting the cost of repairs and all other expenses. This is most encouraging in every point of view.

Mrs. Buckton, of Leeds, has done a great and good work in delivering a course of lectures, first of all to poor women, and then to the children in the Board schools, of which she is a worthy and distinguished member. We well remember how interested and instructed the poor women were in St. Peter's schoolroom, where the lectures were delivered, and with whom we frequently entered into con-

versation on the subjects of the several lectures. She has done well to publish them. In the preface she quotes a pertinent remark from Mr. Stansfield, M.P. "Legislation," he says, "will never make people clean, nor can any sanitary reform be accomplished until the masses are taught the laws of health." Might not ladies in the villages and small provincial towns, as well as in the great towns and cities of our country, form classes of young women and make Mrs. Buckton's work on *Health in the House* the text-book of the lessons given to these classes from week to week during the winter months? And where Bible and select classes are already in existence, or where mothers' meetings are regularly held, might not the alternate weekly lesson be one on the laws of health? At our suggestion one such class has been conducted during the last winter, and the lady conducting it found that the lesson on the laws of health, interspersed with sanitary information suitable to the locality, was exceedingly popular, and in the homes of the poor people some facts given in the lessons have been the subject of conversation through the summer. It is in this way that we are to reach and elevate the people. We must be patient and thoughtful and laborious to a marvellous degree, and never acknowledge ourselves to be defeated. Gentlemen can do a great deal in this work, but ladies are more likely to be successful in this particular line, especially in reaching and elevating the poor of their own sex. Mr. James Hinton's idea comes out in all its force in work of this kind; and salvation from dirt and disease must mostly come through the work of women, as well as salvation from sin and the devil. No

doubt Mr. Hinton was right in thinking that woman has a wonderful mission in refining and spiritualising men, and in recovering and ennobling her ignorant and sunken sisters. Even Christ was greatly comforted by the sympathy and assistance of women; and the ministry of women in the early Christian Church has taught women to work for God and the race to-day, and has also taught the Church to value and greatly to employ the gentler sex in some of the most rough and difficult work of this age. It is the mission of the Church to deal with all secular things, and to engage in every enterprize which will enlighten men and secure their temporal well-being; but we believe women will have very greatly to aid us with their ready wit and ready sympathy, as well as with their good sense and good judgment.

Something must be done to improve human habitations. Dark, damp, unhealthy houses ought not to be let, any more than unwholesome food ought to be offered for sale. Care of course must be taken in judging on these points, that no injustice may be done to the owners of property. But where cottages have become unfit for human habitation, and none but the lowest of the low will occupy them, vested interests are not all-important for town councils to consider when street improvements are contemplated. How can we reasonably expect people housed like pigs to act like moral philosophers? We must improve home and its associations if we wish to improve the people. Houses should be let under more stringent regulations. Competent authorities in towns and villages should decide what houses are fit for human habitation. If the drainage be defective and sewer-gas get into the house, or the

ventilation be bad, or the walls incurably damp, as it is wrong to inflict injury on life and health by these things as to ourselves and families, so it is wrong to inflict injury on the life and health of others. It is our duty to see in some way or other that the poor are not unnecessarily exposed to disease and death, or to impoverishment and degradation. And if property be pronounced unfit for habitation by a competent authority, then we do not see that Government or corporate bodies should bear the expense of its removal, any more than they should pay a butcher for the loss of meat condemned as unfit for sale. But while old houses are pulled down, proper dwellings for the poor should be carefully constructed. Too many put up buildings at the least possible cost, to pay them a large percentage, without any consideration for the life and health of the occupiers. And as soon as the cottages are completed, and in many cases before the workmen have got off the premises the tenant enters. An old foreign proverb says, referring to the unhealthiness of houses hurriedly built and quickly inhabited:—"The first year for my enemy, the second for my friend, the third for myself." Some who build houses in these days care for neither friend nor foe, for no one in heaven or earth. They carry on the trade to make as much money as possible,—the health of the public never enters their thoughts. They build houses back to back or anyhow, unchecked in too many cases by town councils and local governments.

The health of operatives must be cared for. We think there is little doubt that consumption is frequently induced by the neglect of ventilation in factories

and workshops. What a difference you see between factory hands and agricultural labourers; the one set of people pale and feeble, the other ruddy and strong. We presume this difference is mainly to be attributed to the fact that the one class does not work in the open air and the other does. The deteriorated atmosphere in our factories and workshops is a fearful tax upon the health of the operatives. We let sick people have a little fresh air in our hospitals, but exclude it from factories and workshops. Pure air is as necessary to health as wholesome food; yet we do not admit it in proper quantities in private dwellings, in churches and chapels, and especially in crowded work-rooms. It might be advantageous to both masters and men were factories and workshops under constant medical supervision. All medical officers of health should be independent of private practice and local boards, so that they may act without fear of offending their patients or corporate bodies. A public analyst is now appointed in some towns, but in sadly too few, to prevent the adulteration of food, which is one of the crying evils of the age. It is the opinion of some that there is a progressive physical degeneracy in the town populations of Great Britain. Others think that there is not sufficient evidence for a sweeping statement of this character. We fear there is some truth in the former conviction, and that bad food assisted by a bad atmosphere largely contributes to this physical deterioration. Adulterated food must increase physical debility, and help on the decay of the teeth, an evil undoubtedly progressing with our growing and boasted civilisation.

People should have a good supply of pure water. Cesspools, middens, and bad drainage poison the water, and fever and cholera follow as the punishment of sanitary neglect. In a village in Yorkshire two long rows of cottages were connected with a drain. It polluted the water used by the cottagers, and every family was afflicted with fever, with the exception of two who had some time previously cut off all communication with the drain because of its offensiveness.

Unconsumed smoke affects the spirits, and consequently affects the health of the people. Were the atmosphere clear and bright cheerfulness would be much more common, and depression of mind would not so greatly interfere with the operation and functions of nature. It is estimated that we lose a hundred thousand lives annually by preventable diseases, and millions of money through death or inability to work where death does not ensue. A million paupers in round numbers receive help in England and Wales. By attending to the laws of health this average might be greatly reduced. The progress of sanitary improvement should not stop till the towns become as healthy as the rural districts. It was said at the Social Science Congress, held in Leeds (1871), that sanitary laws are now so well understood, that a man might contract, for a fixed sum, to reduce the death-rate of Leeds to a third of what it is at present. Only think of the thousands who find a premature grave by preventable disease, and of the thousands who through preventable disease live a lingering kind of death; and of the misery to orphans, widows and friends caused by preventable disease, and you will see the importance of sanitary improvement. It is a

matter mainly resting with the people themselves, but all of us may help to spread the knowledge of these things, and so help to create a sound public opinion which will influence legislation on the subject. And without strong public opinion the sanitary laws already on the statute book will remain a dead letter. Laws and their administrators are very apt to sleep together, unless the intelligent public rouse magistrates and officers of health and keep them awake.

You see therefore it is part of our duty to care for man as man. By the common ties of nature we are constituted our brother's keeper, the guardian of his natural rights and interests. It can hardly be said to be a want of religion,—it certainly is that and yet it is not,—when man would coldly neglect and suffer physical evil upon his fellow; for in that case it becomes not so much a question of Christianity as of common humanity itself. And we envy not the feelings of the man who can look upon the misery and suffering in the world around him unaffected; who is so entirely destitute of human sensibilities as never to feel his bosom swell as he contemplates "man's inhumanity to man," which "makes countless thousands mourn." Natural sympathy itself should prompt man to a deep and tender regard for the temporal welfare of his fellows. Let it be ours to seek a self-sacrificing and self-forgetting love which perpetually lives for the good of others. "To do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." In every possible way let us aim at doing the people good, seeking enlargement of heart, allowing the law of natural sympathy fully to operate, but especially the law of Christian sympathy.

"Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (John iii. 17). The need of our brother man is vast and varied, and we are under obligation to help him, according to our means, intelligence, and opportunities. More must be done to better the physical condition of the poor, before we can reasonably expect great progress in the morals and intelligence of the people. And this method is not something tacked on to Christianity but a necessary part of it. Christian philanthropists have long been preaching the necessity of improving the physical circumstances of the poor, but at length statesmen are talking of the need of legislators devoting special attention to the subject. But the poor must try to help themselves, while the richer and better instructed portion of the community lend them a helping hand. People generally speaking can do more for themselves than anybody else can do for them. We grieve however to say that with reference to many of the foregoing particulars, many well-to-do people are as ignorant as the poorest in the land.

Few gentlemen of means and opportunities have accomplished a work for their fellows at all to be compared with *what has been done by Sir Titus Salt, at Saltaire.* The sanitary arrangements of the whole place appear to be perfect. Healthful recreation is provided for the people. Schools, baths, lecture-room, library, and houses, cheap and neat, with beautiful little gardens attached, and everything required to render existence healthy and happy. We are not aware of a place like it in the whole of England. Talk of monuments erected to the memory

of men who have been benefactors to their race—here is the grandest monument, reared not by the hands of others but by the thought, love, care, and overflowing goodness of the man himself. If manufacturers had cared half so much for their workpeople, and men of wealth spent their money to improve their estates half as much as did the honourable baronet above referred to, England to-day would have been a very different country from what it is. Our towns would not have been honeycombed with cesspools, and middens, and drains without traps. Deaths would not have occurred so numerously as they do in the poor portions of large towns, where human beings are so thick upon the ground. But if gentlemen will not assist according to their wealth, then the poorer classes who are so largely concerned in sanitary improvements must help themselves as best they can, remembering that such improvements will bring them better health and add years to their lives. Philanthropic workers, however, are multiplying, but they frequently work under deep discouragement.

Let those who are deeply interested in *the elevation of society*—whose very life it is to make the world better than they found it, and who from time to time are disappointed in proportion to their earnest feelings in their noble enterprise, as they see how little at most they can accomplish, and how exceedingly difficult it is even to achieve that little—not bate one jot of heart or hope in the walks of Christian usefulness. The nobleness lies in the struggle to make others happier and better, as well as in the grandeur of the work itself. It may cost you trouble, it may frequently bring you anxiety ; you

may see only failure where you thought you might safely calculate on success; the work you undertake may be harder than you ever expected; but do not give it up because people are indifferent to their own welfare, or because others will not heartily work with you. Do what you can, if not what you would. At the end of life you will feel more comfortable than those who sat still with folded arms and did nothing for anybody. Do the work at hand, not for fame, not for unworthy ends, but for the sake of your brother and your Redeemer. Never weary in it. "In due season you shall reap if you faint not." In some cases you will find men earning two or three pounds a week penniless by Wednesday, and if sick for a week or fortnight applying for parish relief. In other cases you will meet with people who, after all you have said about keeping their homes clean and admitting fresh air, will immediately stop up every broken pane, chimney, and door in the house, loving dirt and living in dirt in spite of all your efforts. Drunkenness, extravagance, ignorance, and ten thousand other impediments may lead you to think it is no use attempting anything for the people. All that you do appears to leave things much as they were before. There is so much to do and so few to help, that you think yourselves like men attempting to remove a huge mountain single-handed. Sometimes people are not only ungrateful for what you do, but bluntly tell you that you are interfering with matters that do not concern you, that you are touching private affairs and destroying individual independence. Bad men and devils will always stand in your way, and put every possible obstacle to improvement in your path.

But men for the times must not be easily frightened or discouraged or driven from their post by a few difficulties. The God-man was not. With a sad and heavy heart He struggled on. The world is better to-day for His persevering toil. As His servants shall it be better for ours? The best efforts of the best men are loudly called for. Society needs men of intelligence and large heart to save the money of the poor, often very hardly earned, to preserve their health and prolong their lives; men who will become prophets in the cause of humanity and unceasingly teach the people their interests whether they will hear or whether they will forbear; men willing to sacrifice themselves for the good of others, counting not their lives dear unto themselves if they can but save their fellows from wholesale destruction; men to give as well as toil in order to improve the condition of the people, not grudgingly or as a matter of hard and cold necessity but lovingly and cheerfully, caring more for humanity than for money; men with strong heads and strong hearts, prepared to do and die, to suffer fatigue, reproach, disappointment, and the loss of all things rather than permit people blindly to go on to ruin; and men who when they come to die will urge others around their bed to take up the cause for which they themselves have unceasingly laboured, and loved as sincerely as the mother loves her firstborn. The particulars we have already referred to establish a claim on the sympathy and help of the wisest and best among us; but that claim becomes a thousandfold stronger when we consider human brotherhood in its social and religious aspects. But the lower as well as the higher claims of humanity

must be attended to. In the language of One who did most to elevate society, "These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." Follow the first of patriots, the first of philanthropists, the first and hardest of Church-workers, the God-Man and the Model-Man; we say follow closely in His blessed steps, and though you may meet with similar treatment from those you endeavour to benefit, and in your measure may have to submit to crucifixion; or like poor Romney Leigh, according to Elizabeth Barrett Browning, you may get your house burnt over your head, and be made blind into the bargain, by the very people you have struggled to elevate:—yet you "shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

II.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS SOCIAL ASPECTS.

CHAPTER I.

CAN THERE BE A CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF SOCIETY?

SOME time ago and again recently, a writer in the *Times* newspaper laughed at the idea of a social science, as if there was not the remotest possibility of such a thing. The National Association for the Promotion of Science he thought had some reason for its existence. But the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science he thought had no reason for its existence, till it clearly made out that there was such a science, or the possibility of such a science. This way of putting the matter is getting stale, and will soon be obsolete. Some men are very hard to please and difficult to satisfy. Surely we can know society; can observe, and analyse the facts and principles of social intercourse, and systematise the knowledge we gain in this way. Surely too we can do all this in a Christian way or on strictly Christian methods. It is just as possible to have a Christian science of society, as it is to have a science of anything that is capable of being investigated. The facts of Christianity can be examined and arranged, till the result obtained is the establishment of fundamental

laws for the regulation of social intercourse; and these laws are embodied in the New Testament.

Mr. Herbert Spencer says, in clear and forcible language, "So far as there can be generalisation, and so far as there can be interpretation based upon it, so far there can be science. Whoever expresses political opinions—whoever asserts that such or such public arrangements will be beneficial for detrimental, tacitly expresses belief in Social Science; for he asserts, by implication, that there is a natural sequence among social actions, and that as the sequence is natural results may be foreseen." Of course no one contends that sociology will ever become, or can ever become, in the nature of things, an exact science. We must not think and speak as if there were no science but exact science. Mr. Spencer says again, "Scientific previsions, both qualitative and quantitative, have various degrees of definiteness; and because among certain classes of phenomena the previsions are approximate only, it is not, therefore, to be said that there is no science of those phenomena: if there be some prevision there is some science." We say yes; and as evil deeds are followed by evil consequences, and good deeds are followed by good results; and as we foresee this, and can make our calculations accordingly, there may be a Christian science of society.

The Study of Sociology by Mr. Herbert Spencer, might have been written to show the impossibility of a science of society. There are so many subjective and objective difficulties in the way; difficulties of an intellectual, emotional, educational and patriotic character; as well as class bias, political bias, and theological bias. He fully believes in the possibility of sociology, and very ably

expounds and defends a science of society,—a science which is the completion of all the other sciences. But he raises so many objections to sociology that it might seem to a superficial reader that to start these was the main purpose of the book. If a personal God did not govern human society we do not see how society could well hang together for a single week. The blunders, the whims, the weakness, the wickedness, and the ten thousand evils we cannot mention of all kinds and degrees, would destroy society utterly and hopelessly if it were not for the government of a personal God. He even makes the wrath of men to praise Him. The bad passions, the class hatred, the self-seeking, as well as the good in men, God overrules so as in some way or other to further the interests of His dominions and to help on the progress of society. Men are free but under absolute government. God governs battles, controversies, science, literature, philosophy, commerce, political and ecclesiastical changes, parliaments and diplomacy, kings and peoples, the Church and the world. He never destroys human freedom, yet while leaving men free agents He governs all the doings and circumstances of men, takes everything up into His great and gracious government, turns it to good account, and in some way or other makes it to serve His sovereign purpose. Without this Divine government of human society the world must have ceased to exist ages upon ages ago. The sins and blunders and passions of men would have ruined everything beautiful and good long since. It will never answer to attempt the construction of society without a personal God, or on anti-Christian principles. Mr. Herbert Spencer and others may attempt

to found society on purely natural ideas and principles; but this is an impossibility in Europe and Christendom because of the moral ideas and principles everywhere in existence, and which have been gathered from the Christian Scriptures, though professedly obtained in many instances from independent sources, and apart from the written revelation of God. A science of society,—society on paper,—without a Divine method of government, with no reference to the fundamental facts and principles of the Christian religion, is an impossible social science. It may be cleverly put together, it may appear workable on paper, but it is melancholy in the extreme and without stable foundation apart from Christian laws, without faith in a personal God, and without prayer for Divine guidance and protection. Society cannot exist with merely the laws of men and the laws of nature to manage human affairs. And if cold, hard, merciless law be all that society has to trust to, if there be no personal God to govern us and ours, it is necessary to invent a God to keep us from utter and hopeless destruction in our state of ignorance and helplessness. If men cannot get on in society better than Mr. Herbert Spencer's clever and intelligent book so triumphantly shows, they need a personal God to look after their interests at all points. It is clear then that natural and Christian principles must be inseparably associated, as the true and lasting foundation of society, and no sociology that leaves out either the laws of nature or the laws of Christianity can ultimately stand.

Can there then be a true science of society, and is it possible to work Christianity on sociological principles? We feel strongly in favour of an affirmative reply. Chris-

tianity says, "Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow;" but it does not absolutely fix the mode of doing this. Christianity says again, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and keep yourselves unspotted from the world;" but it does not state the precise mode of operation, or forbid visitation by organisation, or prevent rules and efforts which will wonderfully multiply your personal power to do good. It is further said, "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." The way and manner of doing good is still an open question. How we shall set about the work is not definitely arranged, is not even touched; but left to personal ideas, tastes, and predilections. The fact is Christianity gives laws and principles, but leaves people to apply and work out these laws and principles according to their own enlightened judgment. It is clear therefore that great scope is left for the thought and intelligence of the Church in its work for the good of society. We may proceed in our work on strictly sociological methods, and employ in our work all the results of observation and experiment. God in fact has left us to find out for ourselves the best method of doing our work. Does not this settle the question, Can there be a true science of society, and can Christianity be worked on strictly sociological principles? If we are to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God; if whatsoever things are true, honest, virtuous, lovely and of good report are to be thought about and acted on; if we are to do to others as we would they should do to us; and if in all

these cases and in all others the method of accomplishing the good of our fellows is left to our enlightened mind, surely there may be a Christian science of society. Whatever is just and right in the teaching of Political Economy, and whatever is strictly righteous in modern sociology may surely be adopted by Christian workers. We ought to be anxious to get the best methods of working. Probably the Church has been too careless about its methods, and it has mostly taken any method that came to hand, too commonly worked without method. We hope such days are gone for ever, and that henceforth we shall attack social evils at the source rather than in the stream.

God governs society. For this purpose He gives laws to society. Society is not a machine which keeps itself going and sets itself right when it gets out of repair, without the interference and superintendence of God. At all events we have not so learned Christ. Evolution —a blind and unintelligent Evolution—does not manage human affairs, but a personal God, who works by human agents and according to established laws. We must therefore respect law, study it, watch its operation, work in accordance with it, and not against it or in violation of it. This is our wisdom and safety both with regard to natural, social and moral law. And the failures of the past admonish us. We have too commonly disregarded law, overlooked many of the facts about us, and worked in utter forgetfulness of the conditions of successful Christian labour. Let us henceforth take advantage of all natural laws and social aids in seeking the moral improvement and spiritual elevation of the people. We need in this

respect to be wise as serpents while we maintain the harmlessness of doves. We should seek meliorative social legislation while we prosecute our Christian and philanthropic work.

Mr. Gladstone said in a speech at Liverpool, some years ago, "Upon the ground of what is termed Evolution, God is relieved of the labour of creation; and in the name of unchangeable laws He is discharged from governing the world." In the *Contemporary Review* Mr. Herbert Spencer charged Mr. Gladstone with becoming the champion or exponent of anti-scientific views. Mr. Gladstone replied by stating that evolution and unchangeable laws were phrases he could not quite understand; but he added, "I have no repugnance to any conclusions whatever, legitimately arising upon well-ascertained facts or well-tested reasonings: and my complaint is that the functions of the Almighty as Creator and Governor of the world are denied upon grounds which, whatever be the extension given to the phrases I have quoted, appear to me to be utterly and manifestly insufficient to warrant such denial." Mr. Spencer explains: "Evolution, as I understand it, and creation as usually understood, are mutually exclusive: if there has been that special formation and adjustment commonly meant by creation, there has not been evolution; if there has been evolution, there has not been special creation. Similarly, unchangeable laws, as conceived by a man of science, negative the current conception of Divine government, which implies interferences or special providences: if the laws are unchangeable, they are never traversed by Divine volitions suspending them; if God alters the predetermined course of things from time to

time, the laws are not unchangeable." It would seem from Mr. Herbert Spencer's views that fixed laws really mean that God has fixed Himself; and that God has made a great machine, the universe, which He is incapable of managing. As Mr. Gladstone says, there is "no conflict between the doctrine of Providence and the doctrine of uniform laws." Surely God who created the world can govern it; and surely He who made the laws of the universe can control and keep them in perpetual operation! If there be nothing beyond blind, unintelligent, unloving force to govern society, then the world is an orphan indeed, and the children of men are given over to black, blank despair!

The morals of trade is a question from time to time exciting a good deal of public attention. It has long been said that "no lawyer can be honest;" but now it seems to be a proposition beginning to be generally accepted that "no tradesman can be honest." Mr. Herbert Spencer has recently published a pamphlet on this subject. This has received a very fair reply in the *Wesleyan Magazine* for June and July, 1880, by Mr. W. H. Taylor. "The tricks of trade" are fully gone into in the pamphlet referred to; and the evidence almost as invariably rebutted by the opponent. Mr. Taylor thinks that the question of morality lies deeper than any particular trade; and that the title of the pamphlet is a complete misnomer, especially considering the immense admissions made by Mr. Spencer. The statement that "trade is essentially corrupt" is, Mr. Taylor contends, far too sweeping a proposition; that particular tradesmen are corrupt is another and an entirely different matter. If Mr. Spencer says,

"We are told that it is the universal custom to mark laces *six quarters*—that is, fifty-four inches—which measure only thirty-six inches;" and if again he says that "he regards mixing starch with cocoa as a fraudulent transaction;" Mr. Taylor replies that starch is good for certain people, and if it be generally known that given manufacturers prepare such cocoa, nobody is deceived but everybody satisfactorily served: and as to the lace, buying and selling is a custon so generally understood that nobody cheats or is cheated thereby; manufacturers sell and tradespeople buy and resell lengths such as they know and expect. We say why not therefore call things by the proper name? If no one is deceived where is the advantage of this, as Mr. Taylor admits, "vicious system"? If tradespeople are not deceived are the public imposed on? Perhaps only till they too get initiated. We fear that the real truth is an unusually great amount of fraudulent practice exists in very many quarters, on the part of men who haste to be rich; but at the same time it is wrong to include all tradespeople in one wholesale condemnation. No doubt there are multitudes of honest tradesmen, as good and moral as the bulk of literary men. But we wish they would always call things by their right names; and so give those tradespeople who are determined to cheat if possible all the less chance to effect their purpose. When all has been said in favour of the morals of trade, we fear they are low enough. It is one of the transparent failings of Mr. Herbert Spencer to exaggerate. We have noticed this elsewhere. Yet there is too much truth in his statements on the immoralities of business. Have we not injured our trade in foreign markets by the

adulteration of our goods? This is said to be so by intelligent manufacturers whom we have met. Are not too many companies floated without capital? Do not upright business men condemn as bitterly as anybody the rottenness of much of the present trade system of the country? We have been occasionally startled by the statements of these gentlemen themselves when freely talking with one another. The following is from *The Methodist* of August, 1880. "How is English capital to be invested? It is stated that £200,000,000 are now lying idle. The experience of Turkish bondholders, and the collapse of a large number of fictitious schemes in our midst have produced caution. Bank interest is better than no interest at all. The lack of safe investments operates, no doubt, to delay the return of good trade. So long as people can only make a partial use of their money they are obliged to limit their expenditure. Many are in this position at present. They are afraid of foreign investments and they distrust home schemes. The question of morality lies at the root of this business. It seems to be necessary that men should now work in companies. They can work more cheaply in this form. But what is the effect of co-operation upon individual responsibility? Does association educate the conscience? Are men as careful and conscientious in handling the funds of a company or a society as they ought to be? Morality is the soul of trade. Our prosperity as a nation depends upon it. Necessity is the mother of invention. The present difficulty to employ capital will lead to inquiry. New modes of investment will be found. Several are hinted at already. The difficulty is that when any new

outlet for money is found there are so many who desire to avail themselves of it."

We feel bound to say in all honesty and fidelity that we cannot regard it as an open question whether it is impossible for the tradesman or solicitor or even the much-abused barrister to be moral. Morality depends far more upon the man himself than upon the trade or profession of the man. Men may be immoral in the best positions and moral in the worst. We are moral or immoral according to spiritual force within us. We shall have our temptations to evil; if we yield we shall become morally bad, but if we resist we shall become morally good. Some yield to wrong in all trades and professions, and some stand fast in their integrity. So that it is as just to speak of the morals of the law, or the morals of art, or the morals of literature, or the morals of music, or the morals of anything else, as to speak of the morals of trade. Trade itself is not degrading any more than literature or law or art or science. It is the man himself who is either good or bad and not his business or profession.

One great difficulty we have to contend with in attempting to elevate the people, is the indifference of the masses to social improvements of all kinds. They do not want to be disturbed; things they imagine will do well enough; they have done so for a long time, and they did well enough for their fathers before them; and so it is difficult to effect any change in long-established habits, however beneficial those changes may be. If good ventilation be secured they often stop up the ventilators. If an excellent and abundant supply of water be provided, they will

not trouble to fetch it, or to use it if in the house. If model houses are at hand in a good and healthy neighbourhood, they prefer to remain in the old houses and low neighbourhood.

Another difficulty of almost equal magnitude is the impossibility, or nearly so, of getting the people to see and understand their own true interests. Ignorance and prejudice keep them from seeing what is really to their advantage. And some half-informed and one-sided thinker in the locality loquaciously pours forth half-truths in their midst, and because he is a trades unionist delegate, or a celebrated local politician and one of their class, he succeeds in carrying the people with him. But surely stupidity and indifference may be overcome as they have been a thousand times in the past.

In the reconstruction of society, public libraries will be great instruments for training the people; education, arts, science, literature, philosophy, will come to our aid; mechanical inventions will greatly assist the progress of communities; and things as yet undreamt of in our philosophy will render social improvement possible though perhaps it can never be very rapid. Advantage will be taken of modern civilisation, no doubt, but not to secure excess of comfort for the few but for the many. Men of wealth will see that it is far nobler to help the multitude than to build immense fortunes; to distribute wealth for the progress of society and the improvement of the race than to become millionaires. The boast of a gentleman that he never lost £10 by anybody in all his life is the greatest condemnation of himself he could have pronounced; for he evidently never did much to help poor

men in commercial difficulties or to start them in business. Is it not grander to make a number of Christian business men than for a man of position to keep an immense business to himself? And Christianity will bring the top-stone and give a finishing touch to all human enterprise, making sociology moral and complete.

Professor Huxley, in the address he gave in Birmingham, October, 1880, at the opening of the college founded by Sir Josiah Mason, said: "Within these walls the future employer and the future artisan may sojourn together for awhile, and carry through all their lives the stamp of the influences then brought to bear upon them. Hence, it is not beside the mark to remind you that the prosperity of industry depends not merely upon the improvement of manufacturing processes, not merely upon the ennobling of the individual character, but upon a third condition—namely, a clear understanding of the conditions of social life on the part of both the capitalist and the operative, and their agreement upon common principles of social action. They must learn that social phenomena are as much the expression of natural laws as any others: that no social arrangements can be permanent unless they harmonise with the requirements of social statics and dynamics; and that, in the nature of things, there is an arbiter whose decisions execute themselves. But this knowledge is only to be obtained by the application of the methods of investigation adopted in physical researches to the investigation of the phenomena of society. Hence, I confess, I should like to see one addition made to the excellent scheme of education propounded for the college, in the shape of provision for the teaching of

sociology. For, though we are all agreed that party politics are to have no place in the instruction of the college, yet in this country, practically governed as it is now by universal suffrage, every man who does his duty must exercise political functions. And if the evils which are inseparable from the good of political liberty are to be checked, if the perpetual oscillation of nations between anarchy and despotism is to be replaced by the steady march of self-restraining freedom, it will be because men will gradually bring themselves to deal with political as they now deal with scientific questions, to be as ashamed of undue haste and partisan prejudice in the one case as in the other, and to believe that the machinery of society is at least as delicate as that of a spinning jenny, and not more likely to be improved by the meddling of those who have not taken the trouble to master the principles of its action."

Clearly, in the opinion of Professor Huxley, there is already a science of society, or there is the possibility of such a science, and one that may and ought to be taught to the people. It may not as yet have attained perfection; it may, in fact, be very rudimentary; but we believe it exists and will progress. It must, however, be a science of society, taking in all the facts and covering the whole ground. The Rev. R. W. Dale, who followed Professor Huxley, very pithily said: "He thought that it might be an advantage to the college itself to occupy its present site near to the Council-house, the seat of the municipal government; near to the Town Hall, their symbol of that public life which had been so active and energetic in Birmingham for the last forty or fifty years; near to the Midland Institute, with its noble provisions for the general

intellectual improvement of the town; and near to the Art Gallery and School of Art, which reminded them that man cared for beauty as well as for truth. It was quite natural that science, in the passion and triumph of her youth, should aspire to universal and undivided empire; she was rather apt to appear before us as a young Cæsar. The professors of the Mason College, however, would only have to look through the windows of that building in order to be reminded that there were other sovereignties than theirs consecrated by the prescription of many centuries. As regarded the fear which was evinced in some quarters with respect to the relations of science, Professor Huxley had been to some minds a kind of Napoleon, or Emperor Nicholas, or Bismarck, whose illegitimate encroachments had been greatly dreaded by those who represented the more ancient provinces of human thought. Let them say frankly that the ancient kingdoms of man's moral and intellectual life were not likely to have their legitimate frontiers driven in by the new empire, of which Professor Huxley was the exponent. He believed that men would still turn from the demonstrations of the class-room to listen to the sweet songs of poets, and to be entranced by the enchanting loveliness which great artists had left on their canvas. He believed that the power of the great teachers of morals and religious faith was still extant, and that the august authority of righteousness, the wonder, the rapture, the awe, and the joy of religious faith still retained, and would continue to retain through all future centuries, their ancient place in the life of man. Art and literature, and ethics and religion, were too strong to be afraid of this young imperial power, whose representative

they had with them that day. Whatever contributed to unfold the powers of man contributed to the progress of human nature, and to the manifestation of the glory of Him whose image, he believed, human nature bore."

Afterwards, and in full sympathy with the subject, "Professor Max Müller remarked that Professor Huxley, in his address, called himself a full private in the army of science. If he was a full private, he was one of those who carried the baton of the field-marshal in their knapsack, and every man of science would be proud to follow him as commander-in-chief. Although the science to which he (Professor Max Müller) had devoted the whole of his life—the science of man—was not yet formally represented in this new college, they might depend upon it that it would find its way into it. It lurked in every corner, and he was convinced that before long it would fill the whole college with its genial warmth. The true college of science could not live if it were to exclude the science of man. To attempt to study nature without studying man was as impossible as to study light without studying the eye."

It is necessary to remember, however, that a science of society without Christianity is an impossible science. As a science of society in its truest and broadest sense is the science of man; and as man is a being with soul and conscience, with a moral and spiritual nature, there must be elements in the science of society to meet and satisfy the need of man's higher aspirations, or such a science of society will utterly and hopelessly fail. There may be cultured intellect, splendid art, inventive skill, and material prosperity, in fact all the blessings of civilisation; but without Christian morality society must and

will perish. The Rev. Joseph Cooke (America) said at the Congregational Union, Birmingham, 1880: "The great difficulty in America now was how to manage the cities by universal suffrage. He was fully convinced that a public conscience could only be created by an aggressive evangelical spiritual Church membership, and it was their profound conviction in America that the cause of governments of the people, and for the people outside the Church, was bound up for good or ill in the cause of government of, by, and for the saints. It might be the will of Providence that the American Republic should perish in history. It might be that the problem of the management of great cities would become insoluble under universal suffrage. It certainly would do so unless a spiritual Church membership, not indebted to the State for anything, so lifted and transfigured public sentiment that the State would not dare to disobey the conscience of the people. There was no statesman in Great Britain so popular in America as that great man who understood America, her faults as well as her virtues, if she had any; and that man would, he believed, tell them, were he there, that he, as a statesman and as a politician, knew that the ultimate hope of civil liberty on the earth was in the omnipresence of the Church, taking no craven or apologetic position before public vice. If in England or America popular freedom was to be justified in history, he believed it would be by the final triumph of spiritual Church membership, putting in awe public vice."

What, again we ask, will lead men to the faithful performance of social duties but Christianity? Are men of means, of leisure, of education—men who have all the

advantages which would secure the mental and social enjoyment of life, and whose longings are for the repose and beauties of country life;—we say are such men to accept the worry and trouble of serving society in the face of opposition and insult without a deep conviction of Christian duty? A conviction for instance that society is the ordination of God, and that in upholding the interests of society they are truly so far serving God? You may say, "Yes, but look at the best men in Greece and in Rome and in other ancient nations; they served their country faithfully, and in many instances at great personal sacrifice, inconvenience, and trouble." We reply, the best men in all ages and nations have had Christian light, from unwritten revelation by tradition, from the Holy Spirit acting on the uninstructed and uninformed conscience, and from the revelation of nature. It has all been light from Christ, however obtained by men; for in all generations He has been "the light of the world." Spiritual light can only come from the Sun of Righteousness. It was Divine light which made the grand men of old do their duty to the State; and it is Divine light which to-day produces the conviction of duty, and leads our statesmen and philanthropists to serve society.

Take the case of Prince Bismarck. In an article in the *North American Review*, Moritz Busch says: Bismarck gave the strongest and most emphatic proof of his strictly religious mind and heart, on that memorable evening at Ferrières, as recorded in my book, *Graf Bismarck und seine Leute* (vol. i. p. 208). I will here recount rather more in detail the main points of that conversation It was September 28th, and we were at dinner. Bis-

marck said—and I report him verbatim, for I took down his remarks stenographically—"The feeling that it is a noble thing to die for country and honour, even without recognition, is sinking deeper into the people now that it is soaked with blood. The corporal has essentially the same sense of duty as the lieutenant and the colonel, that is to say, among us Germans. With us this runs through every stratum of the nation. The French are a mass easily brought under the control of one man, and are then a great force. With us, each one has a mind of his own; but when, as now, Germans are in great numbers of one mind, they can be relied upon for mighty enterprises. If they were *all* of one mind, they would be omnipotent. . . . The sense of duty in a man who submits to be shot dead, alone, in the dark (meaning, no doubt, without the thought of recompense or glory for steadfastly holding the post assigned to him, without fear or hope, and with eye single to his duty), this the French have not. It comes of the residuum of faith in our people—of the fact that I know there is One who sees me, even when the lieutenant sees me not." "Do you believe, Excellency, that they really reflect on this?" asked the Landrath von Fürstenstein, one of the guests. "Reflect? No; it is a feeling, a humour, an instinct—what you please. If they reflect, it is gone; they argue themselves out of it. How, without faith in a revealed religion, in God who wills what is good, in a Supreme Judge and a life to come, men can live together harmoniously, each doing his duty and letting every one else do his, I do not understand. Were I no longer a Christian, I would not remain an hour in the King's service. If I did not obey

God, if I did not count upon Him, I should certainly pay no homage to earthly masters. I should have to live, of course; I should be in a good enough position, and should have no need of them. Why should I fret and toil unceasingly in this world, and expose myself to perplexities and ill-usage, if I did not feel that I must do my duty? I have a firm, unshaken belief in a life after death—therefore am I a Royalist; otherwise I should be a Republican. If I did not believe in a Divine order which has destined this German nation for something good and great, I would forthwith go out of the diplomatic business, or I would never have entered it. To what original to ascribe the sense of duty I know not, except to God. Orders and titles have no charm for me. The firm stand that for ten years I have taken against all possible absurdities of the Court, I owe purely to my decided faith. Take from me this faith, and you take from me my country. If I were not a Christian and a firm believer, if I had not the miraculous basis of religion, you would never have had such a Chancellor. Give me a successor on this basis, and I retire at once. But I am living among heathens. When I say this, I do not mean to make proselytes, but needs I must confess this faith." "But," said Katt, "surely the Greeks and Romans practised self-denial and devotion; surely they had a love of country, and did great things with it; and many people now," he was convinced, "do the same thing from patriotic feeling and the sense of belonging to a great unity." The Minister replied, "This self-denial and devotion to duty toward the State and the King, is with us only a relic of the faith of our fathers and grandfathers in transformed shape—more indistinct and

yet active, faith and yet faith no longer. . . . How gladly I should be off!" he continued; "I delight in the woods and in nature. Take away from me my relation to God, and I am the man to pack up to-morrow, and be off for Varzin to grow my oats. I have then no king, and why? If it were not God's command, why should I submit to these Hohenzollern? They are a Swabian family no better than my own, and I should have no interest in them."

Some people say that the theory of human brotherhood propounded in these pages is very fine indeed, if it could only be worked in daily life. But they regard it as something altogether visionary and impracticable, and so impossible to become anything but a scheme on paper. We reply that precisely the same objection might be as consistently and logically urged against Christianity, and is so urged by many. They forget the past history of the Gospel, and that the grace of God can make hard things comparatively easy of accomplishment. If Christianity can be worked, then this theory of brotherhood is practicable. Read the Sermon on the Mount and the Epistle of St. James, and then ask if we have said anything so extreme and impracticable as these portions of the New Testament appear to be. Christian grace is necessary to the working of any rational scheme of brotherhood, and without grace we despair of anything good among men. Grace must change men and keep them changed, or the most splendid social theories will only be so much waste-paper. It is the evil in human nature which has wrecked so many social schemes for the last three hundred years,—aye, since the days of Plato and Aristotle. We regard Christian grace or the power of God embodied in the Gospel as essential

to the success of all schemes of social improvement. And so if people ask, how is your theory to succeed? we answer, by enlightening, evangelising, and in every possible way spreading Christianity: in short, just as the Gospel itself is to succeed. Christianity is the most potent force in society to-day. And there must be prayer for God's blessing, trust in God's providential government, and in connection with this earnest, consistent, self-denying labour for the elevation of the people. That is, in all efforts for the regeneration of society there must be the linking together of the human and the Divine. We are not so foolish as to imagine that the kingdom of heaven will ever come to mankind, or that a true universal brotherhood will ever be established without the spirit, the grace, and the truth of God. For us society without God and the Gospel means chaos, and despair, and misery. And as in nature there is mutual dependence of one part on another, so in society there is mutual dependence of one person on another. And everything in the world, and all mankind, depend on God. Is it not right and reasonable therefore that we should trust in God, and pray to Him, and obey His commandments? And this does not preclude all possible rational efforts to keep ourselves right and everybody else.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,"—not more and not less, but "as thyself." Paul says to Timothy, "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." Take care of thyself, of thy personal character, and of thy personal spiritual interests; let this be thy first and foremost duty, and thereby thou

shalt become effectually qualified to take care of the interests of other people. But self-neglect leads to the neglect of the characters and welfare of others. This is Christian altruism, and not the altruism of Mr. Herbert Spencer. Christianity never teaches that we are absolutely to disregard ourselves. We must attend to our own character and interests in a reasonable, Christian way, or it would be impossible to do anything for the good of others. This is always supposed and implied in the New Testament, whatever may be stated about sacrificing ourselves for the good of our brother man. Certainly as Christians "none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself;" not for personal pleasure and self-gratification, not just to serve ourselves. Yet we have a joy and interest in serving Christ and others, though it is not selfish, and narrow, and unworthy. Mr. Herbert Spencer pushes the altruistic principle to an extreme. He sets up a man of straw, and then easily knocks him down. Self-neglect is not taught by Jesus and His Apostles, to the injury of bodily life and health. Take Christian teaching as a whole, and you find throughout Scripture the duty inculcated that we are to glorify God in body and spirit which are His; and this must mean at least that we do not injure physical health and abridge natural life, nor inflict damage on soul and intellect. Our whole nature is God's property, and we must not touch God's rights and interests, for they are His sacred possession. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his *Study of Sociology*, speaks of "the religion of enmity and the religion of amity;" and says, "From the books of the Jewish New Testament we take our religion of amity. Greek and Latin epics and histories serve as

gospels for our religion of enmity." He further says: "The religion of unqualified altruism arose to correct by an opposite excess the religion of unqualified egoism. Against the doctrine of entire selfishness is set the doctrine of entire self-sacrifice." He further says: "Brought up, as each is, in the nominal acceptance of a creed which wholly subordinates egoism to altruism, and gives sundry precepts that are absolutely altruistic, each citizen, while ignoring these in his business, and tacitly denying them in various opinions he utters, daily gives them lip homage, and supposes that acceptance of them is required of him, though he finds it impossible." He does not indicate the "sundry precepts that are absolutely altruistic" in his judgment. We fail to find the extreme altruism which Mr. Herbert Spencer points out as the teaching of Christianity. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," not more than thyself, and especially not and hate thyself, which Mr. Herbert Spencer would make it mean. He tries to illustrate the impossibility of working the altruism of the Gospel. "Do but ask," he says, "what would happen if A, B, C, D, &c., each declined to have a gratification in his anxiety that some one else should have it, and that the some one else similarly persisted in refusing it out of sympathy with his fellows—do but contemplate the resulting confusion and cross-purposes and loss of gratification to all, and you will see that pure altruism would bring things to a dead-lock just as much as pure egoism."

He further says, "That self-sacrifice passing a certain limit entails evil on all—evil on those for whom the sacrifice is made as well as on those who make it. While a continual giving up of pleasures and continual submission

to pains is physically injurious, so that the final outcome is debility, disease, and abridgment of life; the continual acceptance of benefits at the expense of a fellow-being is morally injurious." Is it "morally injurious" that a sick man, or an aged and infirm father, or a man who wants work and cannot get it should accept continual benefits at the hands of others? How are these needy people to live if not by continual acceptance of benefits? Christianity does not ask us to afford mere gratifications to people; it simply says aid them in their necessity; and so it effectually provides against the very difficulties Mr. Herbert Spencer supposes may exist. "We are to seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." Christianity nowhere commands us to furnish "gratifications" and mere luxuries to people, nor to neglect ourselves, nor to injure ourselves, nor to destroy ourselves to carry out extreme altruism. It guards bodily life and health; it says of a man who has work and can work and will not work—"neither shall he eat." It as much forbids unnecessarily leaning upon others as it commands charity to the necessitous. And when the world gets to the state in which there will be no need for men to deny themselves for the good of others, then the office of charity will cease, and the affairs of redemption will be wound up. The lavishing of extreme and unnecessary sympathy and gratification on men is not taught and not permitted in Christianity. Mr. Herbert Spencer has given himself unnecessary trouble and alarm. He takes the same extreme views on the subject of non-resistance. "Resistance to aggression," he says, "is not simply justifiable, but imperative. Non-resistance is at variance with altruism and egoism alike.

The extreme Christian theory, which no one acts upon, which no one really believes, but which most tacitly profess, and a few avowedly profess, is as logically indefensible as it is impracticable." Probably here reference is made to some portions of the Sermon on the Mount. All that the Saviour meant was that under certain circumstances, non-resistance was to be practised, as He Himself practised it. In times of persecution, for the time being, if State law oppress us we must submit. Church history illustrates this in many instances; though the persecuted observe the law they have quietly sought its repeal in all legitimate ways. And Christ spoke His most altruistic sentiments on the eve of the most trying times for His Church. This ought to be allowed for in all its force in fairness to the teaching in such an age. Christianity teaches a purer and loftier morality than all philosophers and than all other religions.

It was not for Christians to use physical force against the rulers, nor against individual persecutors. Non-resistance is one of the most powerful weapons for conquering enemies. It has been so in all ages of the Church. Is he the most manly man who, when smitten on one cheek, doubles his fist and hits back again? That would probably provoke a desperate fight. But if when "*persecuted for righteousness,*" and smitten on the one cheek he turns the other also, he is more likely to overcome his foe, who would see in a religion that could make a man love and forgive his enemies a superhuman power. If Christianity be interpreted to mean self-neglect, self-hate, and self-destruction, it may be altruism according to Mr. Herbert Spencer but not according to Christ. The Rev. A. J.

French rightly says in the *Fernley Lecture* for 1879, "The old perversion was bad enough, 'Thou shall love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.' The new perversion is worse, 'Thou shall love thy neighbour and hate thyself.'" True self-love is not selfishness. The original instinct like all others is neither moral nor immoral but unmoral. When does it become selfish? Some would say when it interferes with the happiness of others. But, to say nothing of the ambiguity of the term happiness, it is plain that the state of things described as interference is one that itself requires to be defined. Self-love becomes selfish when pleasure, satisfaction, what is miscalled happiness, is sought without subordination to our highest interests as defined by the will of God. When I love God supremely, then first do I truly love myself. I am to love God's image everywhere; therefore I must love it in my own self. And as the love of the neighbour is one with the love of God, so true self-love is one with both. I may need much direction as to the thought, time and attention to be allotted to each object in this wondrous trinity, but the principles themselves are not opposed. In caring for my own soul's welfare, I am preparing an instrument to promote the welfare of others: in labouring for my neighbour's good I am still permitted, nay, bound, to have "respect unto the recompense of the reward." Altruism is therefore not to be pushed to an unreasonable and illegitimate extreme, but must be kept within rational Christian limits. It has its legitimate sphere in Christianity, in all social transactions, and in every-day life. Scripture rightly interpreted does not mean that the self-regarding virtues are to be absolutely neglected, and the

non-regarding virtues exclusively cultivated. "Take no thought for the morrow" does not mean absolutely no thought at all, or the world on that principle could not exist for a single week, and Christ instead of being the first of teachers would be the most foolish of teachers. It means take no anxious, unbelieving, selfish thought, as such narrow, distrustful thought does no good but harm. By it we cannot mend matters, or alter things; and so it is wise to preserve calm confidence in God.

Writers on Sociology admit the existence of great and terrible evils in society; but the question which we have to face is this,—How are we to succeed in the regeneration of society apart from Christianity? The failure of all merely human methods is transparent.

Imprisonment is one of the methods of men. And we think that the general theory of imprisonment is, that it is partly punitive and partly a deterrent from crime. Probably most people would admit that these ideas lie at the basis of all legislation in the direction of imprisonment. But imprisonment as a means of improving society is all but a complete failure. Prisoners almost always leave prison morally worse than they were before they went into it. New prisoners are corrupted by old ones. As all prisoners are put together before trial, the old gaol birds have a splendid opportunity afforded them, by this defective and reprehensible arrangement, of tainting the comparatively innocent youths pulled up for a first small crime. The old prisoners are confirmed in crime, hardened almost beyond redemption in their evil courses. They have completely lost character and become reckless; and it is in every way wrong to put young and comparatively innocent prisoners

with them. Such imprisonment often educates in evil the youths who in a mixed cell hear and learn what inflicts moral injury for life. We do not say that we can dispense with prisons; but we do say that there is no moral power in imprisonment to effect social regeneration. And though imprisonment is adopted partly to protect society and partly to improve it, yet it fails we fear in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of every thousand. We do not say imprisonment is a wrong thing; there appears to be no alternative but to imprison criminals. But imprisonment is no substitute for Christianity. We need the power of the Gospel to renew and elevate the people.

Another human method adopted is the establishment o industrial and reformatory schools. These we regard as a step in advance of imprisonment, that is, for all moral and spiritual purposes. And yet as the older corrupt the younger in prisons, so it often is in reformatory and industrial schools. The boys and girls are often so thoroughly steeped in evil ideas and in evil habits to begin with,—coming as they generally do from the most degraded homes, and consequently from the most terrible influence and example,—it is difficult in the extreme to make anything better of them. It is right and wise that boys should be taught a trade, and so put into a fair way to earn an honest livelihood. We cannot speak too highly of reformatory schools, and industrial schools, and all those institutions which aid either directly or indirectly social regeneration. How praiseworthy and prudent it is to adopt a measure such as the following reported in *The Manchester Examiner and Times*, June, 1880:—

"A meeting of gentlemen interested in the success of

the industrial training ship *Clio* for homeless and destitute boys, stationed in the Menai Straits, was held in the Manchester Town Hall, the Mayor (Mr. Alderman Hy. Patteson) presiding. Mr. Herbert Birley (Chairman of the Manchester School Board) and others commended the institution to public support on the ground that it was proving an admirable means of saving street arabs from a life of idleness and crime. A large proportion of the 265 boys on board the *Clio* have been sent from Manchester and neighbouring towns. The lads receive elementary instruction, and they are initiated into the duties of sailor life. The annual cost per boy is about £21, of which the Government contribute £13, the School Board £6 10s., leaving some 30s. per head, or about £400 a year, to be raised by voluntary contributions. A subscription list has been opened, with donations of £10 each, from the Chairman of the Manchester School Board and Sir U. J. Kay-Shuttleworth."

The Children's Home, in London, under the care of the Rev. T. B. Stephenson, is another institution established as we think on sound principles of Christian economy. The children are taught a trade, and at Bolton, in Lancashire, there is a branch of the same establishment, with a farm attached; and occasionally a batch of children is sent out to Canada. This is an improved method of aiding the community. It drys up the spring of much social misery; and if it does not always succeed in the regeneration of the soul, it removes formidable impediments to the conversion of people. We have numbers of industrial schools scattered over the country; but the religious element in them is not so great as it is in the "Home"

over which Mr. Stephenson presides. He has been most successful in leading the children to Christ. Dr. Bernardo has a similar institution, which has had, we believe, to say the least, very fair success.

We believe in preventing crime and destitution by methods of this character, and we hope and trust that such methods will be more extensively adopted all over the country. It is of the first importance to keep the young from forming bad social habits. But when such social habits have unfortunately been formed it is of great importance to adopt repressive and reformative measures, which may help if they do not effect social regeneration. Let the most unfortunate boys have a chance of improvement; and let the most unfortunate girls be trained for domestic service, or in some way to fit themselves to take a situation which will support them. If they can be placed under the kind and wise oversight of some philanthropic persons all the better in every way. This is economical both in a social and in a Christian sense. The more work of this character that is done and the better for the Church and the world. But it is very disappointing to find that boys often fall back into old habits of stealing, and girls go again on the streets. We have been startled with the replies to our inquiries in different parts of the country; all showing what a difficult thing it is to change social habits when once they are formed; and that it is the most prudent and the most effectual method to deal with the *cause* of crime rather than to attempt the suppression of the fruits. And we hold that if there be ten successful cases in a thousand, those ten successful cases abundantly justify the existence of any social institution. Yet it is a sorrowful business for

those connected with such institutions to find so little accomplished by their most prudent and painstaking methods. However, let none be too much discouraged, or forsake their post of duty. If it is difficult it is right and honourable work. Having especially looked into this kind of work for many years, we could give hosts of cases of apparently complete failure. The proportion of really successful cases, so far as we can learn from every source, is discouragingly small. We cannot gather extensive and satisfactory statistics on a subject of this nature, but we know enough to conclude that, though great aids, they are not of themselves sufficient to regenerate society. We need another and a greater power than this for such a task. Christianity alone can effectually accomplish social regeneration. When the house is swept and garnished, there must be spiritual conversion, or the restless spirit walks in unwatered places, seeking rest but finding none. Then he goes back to the empty house with a sevenfold diabolic energy, and settles down in undisturbed wickedness, the last state of that man being worse than his first. Therefore to all methods of outward reformation there must be added spiritual religion to make the process safe and complete.

Another human method is education and intellectual improvement. The excellence of this method is indisputable and beyond praise. But this also fails to regenerate society. Take Byron, he was educated; but he was a combination of the brute and the angel. Look at the awful revelations in the divorce courts to-day. The well-to-do people and the aristocrats who go into that court are educated; and it is in danger of becoming a court to

relieve persons who have grown tired of their husbands or their wives. Sometimes you hear it said of a medical man, "Yes, he is a clever man, if you can only get hold of him sober." Holyoake says that education, intelligence, and self-interest guarantee morality. You have all these in operation in multitudes of instances every day, and in multitudes of instances you have daily failure. We want more than the gospel of secularism to regenerate society; we want the Gospel of God.

Another human method, and one partly adopted by the Churches, is to get up all kinds of entertainments and amusements for young people. We do not say that these things are wrong. In fact, we thoroughly approve of all methods which keep people out of public-houses and evil places. But we never knew anybody converted by entertainments, and so we must not expect too much from them; we must not expect from them what they have not in them to give out for the good of society. They are good as far as they go, but they do not go far enough, and are only a subordinate agency, employed to keep people out of harm's way. We have often had to do with the getting up of entertainments for the young, feeling that we would do anything that is innocent to keep young people out of degrading singing saloons, and also feeling a strong objection to making Christianity narrower than the New Testament makes it. But honestly we must say that we greatly fear that penny readings have sometimes prepared the way for the penny theatre. The desire for amusement has been created; and the young people required the strength of the dose increasing, till by-and-by they were lost to all sober and rational enjoyment. They forsook the

house of God, turned away from Christian service, and went into the beggarly elements of the world. We do not say that this is the necessary consequence of entertainments, because we do not think so. But entertainments cannot do much for churches, and have only a limited sphere for accomplishing the good of society. We need the more potent force of Christianity to put and to keep people right.

Another method generally adopted by literary moralists and by moral philosophers in particular, and resorted to by Continental and by English socialists to-day, is to attempt to graft morality on fallen human nature, without seeking the spiritual regeneration of the individual. They do not try to make the tree good that the fruit may be good; but they seriously endeavour to grow good fruit on a bad tree. Without conversion to God, without being born again of the Spirit, people are somehow to become good and to live righteously. These reformers begin outside and attempt to work their way inward, telling people to give up that evil habit, and to cut off the other offensive practice, and to renounce a still worse way of transgressing; but they expect people to obey without the principle and power of obedience. Now God makes men new creatures in Christ Jesus, and so enables them to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world. And while the methods of man fail the method of God succeeds.

Clearly "the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men." Christianity makes the drunkard sober, the thief honest, the licentious chaste, the liar truthful, the idle industrious, and the

wasteful thrifty. Under its influence the village blackguard has become orderly and well-behaved; the lion-hearted colliers of Kingswood and Newcastle-upon-Tyne have become lamb-like, gentle, and peaceably disposed; the tyrant of the family, who was also the terror of the neighbourhood, has been transformed into a noble, generous, loving being that weak women and little children cling to for defence and protection. The most fiendish of men have felt the humanising touch of Christianity, and been found at the feet of Jesus, clothed in a moral beauty of character which has astonished all, and, though spiritually insane before, are now in their right mind. This is the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes. No merely human means and methods can effect a change like this. Philosophy, education, imprisonment, industrial and reformatory schools, the charm of popular entertainments and amusements, the teachings of self-interest, the teaching of science, the teaching of socialism, and the teaching of literary moralists,—we say all these, separately or combined, cannot change one human heart or purify and ennoble one human life. Men do not "gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles." The beauties and amenities of social life do not grow except on "trees of righteousness" of God's own right hand planting. The God and Governor of society alone can renew and elevate it by the instrumentality of a preached Gospel, and by the agency of the Holy Spirit. When the world by its wisdom and methods does not know God savingly and practically, it pleases Him by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Men may sneer at and object to the Divine method, but God works on and leaves men to the acuteness of their folly.

You will say, Christianity proposes to bring all people under its influence and teaching, and by its power to regulate all the operations of society; and though it has now been in the world for nearly two thousand years it has not done, nay it has not half done, this splendid piece of work. No; "we see not yet all things brought under Him." But Christ is powerfully influencing the nations of men by His truth and Spirit and mediatorial government. The ideas of Christ and the grace of Christ are spreading far and wide among the communities of men, even in cases where men deny the credit to Christ and His religion. And we must make reasonable allowance for the slow growth of Christianity. It is so in all great and good things, and also in the operations of nature. We must not therefore be surprised at the slowness of Christian progress; it is like everything else in the world. Corn and trees and animals grow slowly; and the formation of the strata of the earth has been gradual and at an exceedingly slow rate, according to the teaching of geological science. But under the circumstances the progress of Christianity has been marvellous. On any merely natural principle it is impossible to explain the triumph of Christian thought and laws. The Gospel must be of God, and intended to do a Divine work in human society. If this be so, then a Christian Science of Society is possible, though it may be ages before the process of formation is complete. Given a God who governs society, and the Gospel as the embodiment of true social laws, all the rest is simply a question of time. And when a Christian Science of Society is fairly and fully established, it will be the science of man in the truest and deepest and broadest sense.

CHAPTER II.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

FROM the Protestant Reformation to the present time, imaginative thinkers and philosophic dreamers have been roused to efforts for their race by the consideration of the down-trodden and oppressed among mankind. Frequently their ideal creations have been more beautiful than practical. But it must not be forgotten that their aim was very largely to ridicule the inconsistencies of existing society by fancy pictures of what society ought to be Men have looked at the extremes of wealth and poverty, at the luxuries of the rich and the deep indigence of the deserving poor, and wondered if there was not some happy medium to be found between the two. Just as we in the present age of "iron competition" and "life at high pressure" complain of the severe struggle for existence, and wish in some way to rid ourselves of the excessive strain to nerve and brain, so men in all civilised communities have from time to time mourned over the defectiveness of existing social arrangements. The poets and philosophers have caught the popular sentiment, and woven it into a gorgeous ideal picture of society in some far off land of beauty, comfort, and restfulness. But the most glorious ideal and hope of perfect society are brought to us not in secular literature but in the Christian Scriptures. The golden age is not found in the past, but in the future

of the world under the reign of Jesus. We hear of "the good old times" and of "the merry days of old," but we strongly doubt if the former days were better than these; and we more than doubt their being equal to "the good time coming" when Christianity has fully done its work on earth.

Perhaps all great movements in the political and religious world give birth to social theories more or less visionary. The poets and philosophers are the first to give shape and force to the vague socialistic tendencies of the multitude. By subtle intuition the seers see the hearts of men stirred by the strong currents of popular feeling, and they feel more deeply than any others. Hence, socially speaking, "young men see visions, and old men dream dreams." It was under such circumstances that Sir Thomas More wrote his *Utopia* some three hundred and sixty years ago. There was an approaching outburst of popular discontent, social, religious, and political, which ended in the Protestant Reformation. The man soon to be Lord Chancellor of England under Henry VIII. saw the existing state of things, caught the general excitement, and so wrote his little book, startling the learned world by a theory of perfect society in the nowhere land, in perfect contrast with society in the land they knew so well. As Mr. Green says, in his *History of the English People*, "From a world where fifteen hundred years of Christian teaching had produced social injustice, religious intolerance, and political tyranny, the humourist philosopher turned to a nowhere, in which the mere effort of natural human virtue realised those ends of security, equality, brotherhood, and freedom, for which the very institution of society seemed to have

been framed. . . . . The whole system of society around him seemed to him nothing but a conspiracy of the rich against the poor. In *Utopia* the aim of legislation is to secure the welfare—social, industrial, intellectual, religious —of the community at large, and of the labour-class, as the true basis of a well-ordered commonwealth. The end of its labour-laws was simply the welfare of the labourer." No one supposes that Sir Thomas More expected to see his theories worked out in his own day; but he held up the mirror to England and to Europe, that all might see the social wrongs of the age reflected. The Rev. M. Kaufmann, in his *Utopias*, says: "Short hours of labour, sanitary reforms, healthful recreation, popular education, just principles of penal law, religious toleration, the amity of nations,—these war-cries of the social reformers in our own day are all anticipated in the social romance of Sir Thomas More." Sir Thomas More has been called the father of modern Communism. But that is unjust to his memory. No one knew better than he did that among ordinary mortals his scheme of social improvement in all its details could never be carried out, and he here and there drops hints against the literal application of his principles. Communism, as we understand it to-day, was not held by him.

The International Congress, held in Basle in 1879, said, "Private landed property is to cease." Proudhon has said straight out, "Property is theft." Lassalle declares that "Present possessions are alienated property." Are we to understand from language of this character that all who honestly acquire wealth are thieves? Perhaps Communists would hardly say this point-blank, but rather that the present order of society frequently leads to or

compels the best disposed employers of labour to make hard terms with their workpeople. They appear to think that the great competition of the age leads to the lowering of wages below the true value of labour, and that in this way the capitalist robs the working man. Like a sponge, capital drinks up, they contend, the worth of the poor man's work, and the poor man is compelled to accept inferior wages for fear of the loss of work. Perhaps the socialism of the age is mainly caused by the gigantic development of modern industry, and the observed inequality which has accompanied the distribution of acquired wealth. And this socialism is led on by men of thought, learning, and character. Perhaps Continental speculations have been more injuriously felt in England than in Germany or France. Dr. Schäfle says in his work on Socialism, translated and adapted by the Rev. M. Kaufmann, "Trades Unions in England reach their fullest development." What will be the outcome of this socialistic movement? What of agrarian socialism in Ireland? In England discontent vents itself not only against the landed aristocracy, but against capitalists. Will farm labourers organise more and more against their employers, as artisans of all kinds have done? And how are we to treat modern socialism? Does it claim a fair and full trial at our hands? Would not the attempt to put down trades unionism by legislation in all probability aggravate the evil? Beside, have not working men every legal and moral right to combine for the purpose of getting the best possible price for their labour? We may not be able to see how this in the long run is to benefit the working man, as masters can combine to resist the claims of work-

people, and then it is simply a test of strength, and, according to the proverb, "the weakest must go to the wall," which weakest are presumably those who have the least money. And if wages go up all round, where is the real benefit to the working man? He certainly earns greater wages, but he has to pay more for all he buys, and so he is exactly where he was before, so far as we are able to see. All these are matters for reasonable Christian consideration. It is useless to get out of temper and to storm at working men indiscriminately. Is it not better to seek the social improvement of the labouring classes? May not all difficulties be better got over by timely and reasonable social reforms? Is it not far more Christian to look at social questions in a brotherly spirit, and to give a full and impartial hearing to all grievances? Let us look at everything fairly and fully, however unwelcome and disagreeable it may be to us at the time, especially if it be based upon truth and scientific investigation. We cannot stop the progress of thought and social improvement by gunpowder and bayonets. And we ought not to attempt a policy of irrational repression. The evil we try to cure in this way will be sure to break out in some other form with tenfold energy. Progressive legislation is the truest and wisest conservatism. There always have been social changes, and we suppose that there always will be till the millennium itself comes. The most prudent and Christian way to act in all these matters is to do what is brotherly and right; to do towards others as we would they should do towards us if we were personally placed in the same circumstances. This is the Christian policy for individuals and for nations, and the violation of it by indi-

viduals or by nations is followed by penalty in some way or other. You may not accumulate as great fortunes by trade as did your forefathers; but great wealth is not essential to your happiness or welfare. God is the Governor of all things, and if you do right He will cause all things to work together for your good.

Communism forbids while Christianity allows the possession of private property, and says distinctly enough that the possession of private property is not sin, is not the transgression of God's law, provided that property has been honestly and righteously acquired. If the property be unlawfully acquired that is sin enough; and if it be unlawfully used the thing is further and more grievous sin still. The destruction of private property, moreover, would be the termination of business and the extinction of human life, so far as we can see at present. For instance, how are people otherwise to get tools to work with, and the other ten thousand means and opportunities of working? that is—how are they to get machinery, fabrics, and the raw material generally without which there could be no employment for the masses? Without private property how are the multitudes to be armed with the power to support and develop themselves? for unless somebody has property work could not be found. Work implies capital and the investment of that capital in trade. If the State is to do all this for the people, we want to know how the State is to do it all without becoming a terrible tyrant, crushing all private enterprise, and destroying all individuality. We imagine Communism would lead to a general scramble for the good things which would belong to everybody in general but to nobody in

particular. How could people be got to work if they had a common fund, and a common stock of goods, and a whole community to depend on for the supply of what was necessary? The social theories of the French writers were prepared to get rid of an old tyranny, and they gave birth to a new and a worse tyranny. Socialists would coerce in order to get their systems worked, but God in Christianity never does. He reasons with men, tells them their duty, and then leaves them in all things to personal freedom of thought and action. Communism destroys individuality. The person with it is nothing, and the State is everything. And if Communism were to succeed on its declared and understood principles it would become the worst of despotisms under the name of liberty and equality. In reading the various theories of socialism we are struck with the folly and failure of all attempts to improve on Christianity; and we see in social as well as in spiritual things that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men."

Another important point to be noted here is, that *Christian Communism was a purely voluntary thing in the early Church.* The owners of property sold it of their own free will, and as their own voluntary act and deed placed it at the Apostles' feet. With the greatest personal freedom they disposed of it, and with equal freedom they "parted" what they had realised for their "possessions and goods" among their brethren, "as every man had need." This is clearly taught us in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 42—45; and if possible more clearly taught us in the fourth, 32—35. But in the fifth

chapter especially the whole case is fully and explicitly brought out in the language of Peter to Ananias. "Whilst it remained was it not thine own, and after it was sold was it not in thine own power?" Evidently there was no compulsion, as is the case in the theories of modern Communism, which is not Christian but political, or anti-Christian for the most part. The Christian Communism of the early Church was a purely spontaneous thing occurring in the midst of a marvellous revival, and in most exceptional circumstances; for amid the opposition and fierce persecution of the times ordinary secular business was greatly interrupted, and men, women, and children were greatly thrown upon the peculiar care of the Church, which needed special funds. It is doubtful if having "all things common" could have continued after the Church got properly organised, and things generally settled down into ordinary regular working. We think that in the interests of family and individual life it was not desirable that community of goods should continue in the Church. But it is a beautiful illustration of the singular force of the Christian religion that, at the commencement of this dispensation, God's grace so wonderfully melted human selfishness, and for a time at least greatly absorbed individuality. Community of goods was the simple and touching expression of the work of grace, and of Christian unity. This was altogether brought about by the marvellous outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and not by political socialism. And if "the love of money is the root of all evil," then what a generous and self-sacrificing spirit existed in the early Christian Church, in which "none said that aught which he possessed was

his own." When will the Church of Jesus attain such spiritual elevation again? Not taking the form of community of goods, but really carrying out the spirit and principle of Christian stewardship, which says, "All I have belongs to God; I am only a steward, and not absolute owner; and so I will make money for Christian purposes, and not be excessively anxious about accumulating great wealth for myself or for my offspring." But as to the continuation of what we may fittingly or allowably call the Christian Communism of the early Church, it was not only voluntary and temporary, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether or not it ever was the ordination of God, and whether or not in the very nature of things it could have continued much longer than it did. In itself it was such a sacrifice of individuality, such a price to pay in personal freedom, forethought, economy, and all the grand attributes that go to make up our manhood, that it becomes very doubtful indeed if that God who has made man what he is, ever designed it to be a permanent arrangement among His people. If carried out to the end of the ages it would greatly undo God's work in creating us what we are; and though the full and consistent development of our intellectual and moral manhood is not unattended with dangers, yet clearly God meant us to brave these dangers rather than that our manhood should be of an inferior character.

Socialism, again, is at deadly war with capital and private enterprise, while Christianity permits and encourages both. Capital is called the child of labour. It is said to be the pure creation of labour. And many hold that it exists to-day as the awful consequence of the unequal distribution

of the fruits of labour. If labour be wealth and the only wealth there is according to some, how are articles of food and clothing so much labour, simply and solely in themselves? Is not nature a productive source of wealth as well as labour, and even more than labour? And what is all the labour under the sun apart from nature? Take in all the facts and look at all the sides of truth, and then we think it will be seen that wealth is not only the product of labour but of nature also, and of nature perhaps even more than labour. The soil gives us abundant crops, while labour is necessary to win the crops from the earth. Both must go hand in hand and be inseparably linked together, as each theory by itself only contains a half-truth. And it must never be forgotten that the supplies of nature are limited, and that they are unequally distributed among the different peoples of the earth; and so wealth is more easily obtained in one portion of the globe than it is in another. Beside, the sea as well as the soil is a most prolific source of national wealth. "The most frequented fishing grounds are much more prolific of food than the same extent of the richest land. Once in a year an acre of good land carefully tilled produces a ton of corn, or two hundred-weight or three hundred-weight of meat or cheese. The same area at the bottom of the sea, on the best fishing grounds, yields a greater weight of food to the persevering fisherman every week in the year. Five vessels belonging to the same owner, in a single night's fishing, brought in seventeen tons' weight of fish—an amount of wholesome food equal to that of fifty cattle, or three hundred sheep. The ground which these vessels covered could not have

exceeded an area of fifty acres." Now the fish exist without human labour, though man has to labour to bring them into the market. And as fish without labour are abundant in the sea, so some parts of the globe are most productive with small toil, insomuch that some have said, "Tickle the soil with a hoe and it laughs in a harvest:" so that the soil and the sea are sources of wealth, and we must take note of these facts, as well as of the labour of the artisan.

Socialism forbids the institution of the family, while *Christianity does not destroy but upholds the institution.* Socialism would make an end of family life, would terminate the institution at once and entirely. Communism strikes at the root of the family tree, would cut it down and consume it in a general social conflagration. It would for ever break up and destroy all families whatsoever, and have all children brought up in public institutions. In fact it would have community of goods, community of women, and community of children. Both the individual and the family must be sacrificed to the State. We in England are a nation of families; so it is also with the nations of Europe and with America; and a bright and blessed thing it is for these peoples of Christendom. We have our family homes, our family pew in the house of God, our family gatherings from time to time, our strong family feelings and friendships. The family is a State in miniature, and a beautiful and happy picture is here furnished of the citizenship of a Christian country. With the family life the national life is bound up. And so for wise and weighty reasons Christianity sustains, defends, and ordains family life. We must be careful to secure

for ever this unspeakable advantage to the State. And while Communism would have us give up the family for the State, we would keep up the family for the good of the State. As one puts it, to give up the family would be "to throw away the baby with the bath." We in England know better, and value the family too much to perpetrate an act of folly of that character. And through both Testaments the family is spoken of with emphasis. Parental responsibility is an important element in the stability of nations. The parent is to train up the child in the way he should go. Communism dreads the family because it dreads over-population ; and so it seeks the destruction of the family lest the family should destroy it. Are not the true remedies emigration, and moral and spiritual education? People must be taught to see and to act differently from what they frequently do, especially in thickly-populated countries and districts. Self-restraint and self-control ought to be exercised. Matthew Arnold says in that singular yet clever book, *Culture and Anarchy*, "What right have people to have children unless they can support them?"

Socialism claims absolute equality for all while Christianity allows inequality. The question of equality lies at the basis of almost all the theories of socialism to-day and in the past. But equality is at deadly war with all nature and all history. All are certainly equal before God and in the eye of Christian law; that is, they have the same law to govern them, and the same God to rule over them, and the same Saviour to save them, and the same Gospel to instruct them, and the same Spirit to enlighten, to purify, and to comfort them. All are equal before English law. There

is not one law for the poor and another law for the rich. The rich by their wealth can certainly take advantage of the law when the poor man through his poverty cannot. But when we have made a few exceptions there is hardly anything equal under the heavens, in the heavens, or above the heavens. There is no equality in mind, in physical nature, nor in gifts and graces of a spiritual order. How then are we to effect equality in social circumstances? There was a "Society of Equals" formed in France by Babœuf, but it made nobody equal. It is thought by some that equality will be accomplished by education. But how can equal education lead to equality? There is not equal capacity to begin with. Nor is "one man as good as another," though the Irishman declared he was, "and a bit better," as the story goes. Some men are better than others, mentally and morally; and some workmen are better than others, worth twice as much as others in the labour market any day. How can men marked by sense, by industrious habits, and by all the essential qualities for rising in the world get on in life as they ought if trades unions insist on equal wages, equal work, and no piece-work? Is not this to keep down the best men, and to give the advantage to the weakest and the worst? How can there be a private venture, or the culture of the spirit of private enterprise, if a man is to do no over-work or piece-work? To insist on equality seems to us a struggle after the impossible. We do not find equality anywhere; and there do not appear to be any elements in any society out of which any man or any number of men can ever build up equality among mankind. Probably if equality were effected to-day, it would not last in any one essential par-

ticular for a single week. The unity of variety is infinitely preferable to the unity of equality. Let men combine to build up a society which allows all kinds of healthy variety, and not attempt to establish a dead level in social status, amount of income, or expenditure, or labour, or enjoyment. Socialists should first equalise minds, desire, ambition, and necessities; and then perhaps there would be some hope of success in their efforts to equalise circumstances—but not till then.

Co-operation among working men is one important branch of Socialism, and it is a form of it peculiar to this age. Whatever political or ecclesiastical opinions men may hold we do not see how they can consistently object in principle to co-operative associations. The principle of co-operation runs through all society,—through church organisations, political parties, commercial companies; indeed without the principle of co-operation we are at a loss to see how the world would get on. What are railway companies but great co-operative associations? So we may also say of banking companies, of limited liability companies, of political clubs, of sick clubs, of insurance societies, and of a hundred kindred minor organisations. They are all associations for mutual helpfulness, combined efforts for the benefit of one another, and, in principle, they are all essentially co-operative. And co-operation may be very good and necessary in some degree, provided it does not crush and destroy healthy private enterprise. Many people in these days expect great things from co-operation. Among working men it is a new principle in society, and may possibly be fruitful of public good. It will be so if it lead working men to thrift and self-help. But small shopkeepers, and

people in a small way of business generally, may suffer considerable inconvenience till society has adjusted matters and adapted itself to great and it may be violent changes. However, some tradespeople have always suffered, and workpeople too, from changes of fashion, and of machinery, and from social improvements generally. New modes of life and work are sure to tell unfavourably on some, while they benefit society as a whole. We cannot rationally object to social progress and improvement. And competition itself is good for the public, but not always agreeable and pleasant for the competitors. Private enterprise, existing side by side with co-operative societies, may be of immense advantage to the public. But we do not for one moment imagine that the establishment of co-operative associations will bring back a lost paradise. If working men, with small means, combine for the good of labour, masters and capitalists may also combine for the protection and interest of wealth; and then you have simply one combination set against another combination. In that case, if you apply the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, it really means that in the struggle there will be the survival of the strongest, and the weakest will die out. It is so in business life as well as in physical life. We see that Christian brotherhood only will meet the case, and be of permanent benefit to mankind. It is God's method, and we cannot possibly improve upon it. We may establish associations which in the end will be seen to be gross caricatures, or false and imperfect imitations, and which will fail in the future as they have in the past. But it is only reasonable and right that Christian brotherhood should be put upon a proper scientific basis, that it should

be worked in harmony with all that is true and trustworthy in political economy, and that a science of society should in all essential elements be pure Christian sociology, and not merely political or infidel in its character. In co-operation mutual interests become one strong bond of union between men; but co-operation being a new thing among artisans, the experiment has not been sufficiently tried to enable us to found a proper judgment upon it. Already it has passed through many grave reverses. A severer test awaits it when it not only has to compete with private enterprise, but with itself in the form of numerous co-operative associations. For we must expect that by-and-by co-operative societies will compete with one another; and if ever a period of universal co-operation comes, we do not see that it will be any improvement upon an age of private enterprise and limited liability companies. So far as we are able to judge at present, it will be the simple substitution of one form of competition for another; and we do not expect heaven to be brought down to earth by that process. Dr. Lightfoot, the present worthy Bishop of Durham, in his address to the Co-operative Congress held in Newcastle-upon-Tyne on the eighteenth of May, 1880, says many valuable things, and almost covers the whole question by his remarks.

"Co-operation fosters just those two habits of life which distinguish civilisation from barbarism, and the higher forms of civilised life from the lower. The one of these is providence, or the habit of looking forward; and the other is association, or the habit of looking around and combining with others. Thus it is a civilising influence of the highest kind. Providence is its lesson, and association is

its school. . . . . Through it the firstborn of providence is a virtue of the first rank. In the poor man it means self-denial in the present, freedom and independence in the future. It makes saving possible in the first instance, for through its distributive stores it cheapens the commodities of life for the working man, while it guards him from running into debt. It makes saving profitable, in the next place, for through its productive agencies it provides investments for his savings, and, last of all, it dignifies thrift, for it employs his savings so as to utilise his own labour. This is the true goal of co-operation. It aims at making the working man his own capitalist, and thus gives him the command of his own labours. In this way it places him in a position of social independence. If it succeeds it will gradually distribute capital among the many. And this it will do without weakening the motive power of capital, for the combination of numbers, replacing the monopoly of a few, will still secure that aggregation of capital in large masses which is necessary for the full exercise of its force. . . . . At the same time the principle of association tends to correct and qualify the egotism of mere thrift, of mere self-help. Compared with any other expedients for attaining the same or substantially the same results co-operation has far the highest claims to respect. Do not set out with the idea that co-operation will regenerate society. If society is regenerated it will be by some agency deeper, more moral, more human, more Divine, something which lies closer to the heart and conscience of man than any economic measures, however valuable. Co-operative enterprise, if successful, will promote economic reforms; it will redress economic grievances; it will even

produce subsidiary moral results, not unimportant in themselves. But will it do more? Will it usher in a reign of universal brotherhood? Will it substitute universal sympathy and goodwill for universal competition? Co-operation may modify competition, it may shift competition. But will it do more? Co-operation begins by competing with the retail dealer. It goes on to compete with the capitalist, but its working cannot stop here. If the movement grows the time will come when the co-operative factory or one co-operative store must compete with another. . . . . We are confronted with two very serious questions: first, is it desirable in the interests of the community at large that the shopkeeper should disappear before the storekeeper, and, secondly, is it likely that this will be the result of the movement? I see that in the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee and elsewhere, the first question is answered somewhat decidedly in the affirmative by several advocates of co-operation. I confess that I do not see my way to this simple answer. I could not look without some dismay on a movement which would press cruelly on a class of men so numerous and so highly respectable as the small shopkeepers. But as a matter of history, we have found that panics of this kind have rarely, if ever, been justified by the result. The change has been more gradual than was anticipated, fresh industries have been developed, and unexpected opportunities have been opened out to the very classes which seemed likely to be the greatest sufferers. In some way or other there have been unforeseen compensations, so that what social change has taken away with one hand it has replaced with the other. . . . . Is it too

much to hope that the credit system will have received a mortal wound? Thereby shopkeepers will see, they have begun to see already, that to compete with the co-operative stores they must minimise bad debts by demanding ready money. Nothing can be more faulty than the credit system. It is a tax upon the thrifty for the advantage of the thriftless; thus it inflicts a double wrong on the community. It mulcts the meritorious while it rewards the undeserving. I do not doubt that in very many instances credit is given to the needy purchaser from motives of the purest benevolence. But as a system it is demoralising. However much he may desire it, the small tradesman at present finds it difficult to extricate himself from this system. But the existence of a co-operative store in the neighbourhood will help him out of the difficulty. It will apply the pressure of a necessity, and it will afford the support of a precedent. Moreover, the small shopkeeper himself will in time avail himself of the co-operative principle. A wholesale co-operative store established among shopkeepers will enable them to purchase the goods which they retail on more advantageous terms. There are signs already that co-operation is likely to be developed in this direction. If this is done I do not see why the retail dealer should despair of his future position. He has, at all events, this in his favour, that personal attention and adaptability to the wants of individual customers is more easy in his case than it is for the general storekeeper, and common experience states that in matters of buying and selling this is a great point."

If co-operation should succeed in destroying the credit system, at present prevailing so extensively, it will have

accomplished one of the grandest reforms for small shopkeepers and for working men. The credit system is social slavery. It ties the hands of all parties. It not only keeps them in their low condition, but plunges them to a lower and yet lower depth; till all parties lose heart and give up the struggle to better themselves in utter despair, and so float helplessly on the stream. If co-operation put an end to this state of things, either directly or indirectly, it will have wrought incalculable and lasting good to the community, and especially to small tradespeople and artisans.

The socialists of to-day are almost entirely absorbed in selfish considerations. The home-rulers in Ireland do not want to pay rent, and think that they have a right to the land. They look at what they call their personal rights and not at personal duties or at the rights of other people. So again it is with artisans. They are exclusively occupied with the rights of labour, and overlook many important points in political economy. So too of productive co-operation. At the last Co-operative Congress held in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1880, Mr. W. Swallow read a paper on productive co-operation, and advocated the purchase by co-operators of co-operatively produced goods and food in preference to the purchase of goods and food which are not co-operatively produced. This has in it all the narrowness and selfishness of the old trade guilds. It is co-operation asking for protection and monopoly, and the Congress actually passed this resolution: "That in the opinion of this Congress, it is the duty of purchasers in co-operative stores to give a preference to goods co-operatively produced, unless the interests of the members

are thereby injured, if those goods are not inferior in quality or price to the same goods produced by private firms."

All the different classes of socialists appear to be occupied with one question in many forms, "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me." Forgetting that if they are to share with those above them in the social scale, to be logical and consistent they must share with those below them. Mostly when men think of the division of property, they look at the question in relation to those who possess more property than they do, and not in relation to those who possess less. But if a division must come, then there must be a fair and equitable division, and working men must divide their goods and their wages with working men who have fewer goods and less wages. Is it not perfectly fair that the man who is earning twenty or thirty shillings a week should divide with the man who only gets ten or fifteen shillings; and that the clerk who gets five pounds per week should divide with the clerk who only gets two pounds per week? If there must be a division, let it be fully carried out, and then you cannot stop till you get to extreme Socialism or pure Communism.

Here is an amusing and instructive report of the Socialist Congress held in Paris, 1880. It is given in one of the daily newspapers.

"The Socialists, who so far from being social, are declaring bitter war against society, are assembled in solemn conference in Paris, and yet the world does not seem to be alarmed. Is it because the peoples are engrossed in their selfish pursuits, in money-making and

place-seeking, that in the face of a menace of new dangers they are dumb? Not exactly; though no doubt the timid who are disposed to look on the resolutions of the Socialist Congress seriously should have some reason to feel disquietude. Private property is to be abolished, the people are to be armed, a legal minimum of wages is to be fixed yearly according to the price of provisions, a progressive income and legacy tax is to be substituted for all other imposts. All churches are to be disestablished. St. Monday, beloved of Crispinites and colliers, is to be made a national weekly holiday, and it is not obscurely intimated that if these 'claims of right' are not conceded, the Chamber of Deputies may be blown up with dynamite. The Socialist Congress consists of seventy men, who, judging from their discussion, have about seventy-five opinions, and the seventy have not scrupled in their zeal for their order to arrogate the right to say, 'We, the people of France.' Seventy, we said they were; but it is really only sixty-nine. One delegate from Havre, more intelligent or less fanatical than his colleagues, has shaken the dust of the congress from his shoes. He had a programme of his own, somewhat extreme, but much more moderate than the other, and its fundamental principle was that working men to improve their condition should trust to their own efforts and not to the State. He, however, was behind the age, and he left with something like a declaration that the delegates were a parcel of humbugs who represented neither Paris nor the provinces. Humbugs they may not be, but they are certainly amusing. On the day after the secession of their Havre colleague, they proceeded to enforce Proudhon's maxim that '*La propriété c'est le vol*,' by

devising a scheme for dividing the vaguely estimated 'several milliards' of French capital into sums of sixty pounds each for all the population. It was thoughtfully provided that if a man liked with that sum to live a 'contemplative life' he might do so, and if he liked to work to increase it, he was not to be forbidden. This idea of the division of property is a very old one, but the manner in which the seventy Socialists proposed to accomplish it reminds us of a story which may form a commentary on their theory. It was in Frankfort during the brief revolt of 1848. A deputation of ten men waited upon Rothschild, the banker, and told him that they came from the provisional government, who had just decreed a division of property, and that they were instructed to take steps for dividing his treasury. 'How much money do you think I have, gentlemen?' he asked. 'A million francs,' was the reply. 'And how many do you claim to represent?' 'Five hundred thousand persons,' said they, exaggerating in unconsciousness of the trap that was being laid for them. 'That,' said Rothschild, 'is just two francs each,' as he handed the coin to each of the ten, who were considerably astonished at this application of their theory, but were prevented by the arrival of the military from giving practical effect to their dissent from the argument."

Now Christ did not come as a divider of inheritances. When the man said to Him, "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," the reply appears cold and stern—"Man, who made me a judge and a divider over you?" And He immediately proceeds to speak of the blessedness of Christian con-

tentment, and cautions them against excessive struggling for mere wealth and social position. "Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." And He illustrates this by the parable of the rich man, who got all he could, and kept it to himself, and died a great fool in God's estimation. So there is something to be sought greater and nobler than material wealth. And is not the struggle for division of property to-day keeping many men from greater and truer riches? Now as Christianity was neutral in relation to the question of slavery, and the division of property, and the standard of wages, so it is to-day. It does not entangle itself in questions of party politics and social questions in the sense of taking the side of the poor against the rich or of the rich against the poor. It does something immensely grander and better. It gives laws and principles of action which will terminate slavery, injustice, tyranny, and every species of wrong to everybody above us or below us. It is fair on all sides and toward all classes; like God Himself it is no respecter of persons. It says, You are brothers; go and act as Christian brothers, and that will settle your quarrels and end all injustice and wrongdoing between you. It says, "Servants, obey in all things your masters," when those servants were common slaves. Waiting for a new state of things was better than rebellion. It says also, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is *just and equal*, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." So the principles of Christian teaching carefully guard both sides. It says as to the wage question, "Be content with your wages." When the

soldiers came to John the Baptist asking for a law of duty; they had made a bargain—they must keep to it, and not plunder. It does not interfere between masters and men, but it states *the law of right*, and then leaves people to their own conscience and intelligence, telling them that the final judgment of all parties will be at the last day.

The question of wages comes out in the New Testament in the parable of the labourers. The principle of justice is seen in giving all that the master engaged to give. A penny in those days was considered in the labour market a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. But the parable shows too that a master may go beyond the strict principles of justice, and of his charity give a little more to one than he gives to another. That is, a master may be merciful as well as just, and in that case he neither wrongs other labourers nor other masters. So long as he keeps within Christian law he may do "what he will with his own." He *may* be merciful, but he *must* be just in dealing with his workpeople. Some Christian masters kindly do, in many ways, for workpeople what is equal to an increase of wage, though they cannot raise the wages of servants without being considered censurable by other masters with whom it is understood that they are to act as men of business. A Christian farmer once said, "I cannot raise the wages of my men without giving offence to my neighbours, but I allow them so much milk and so many potatoes in addition to their pay."

Trades unions take into consideration the question of wages. It is a very large and difficult question, and ought

to be discussed in the best possible temper on all sides by masters and by men. English working men should consider that workpeople on the Continent work longer hours and for lower wages; and so English manufacturers cannot fairly compete on these points with Continental manufacturers. It was commonly said in Bradford, two or three years ago, that Frenchmen could come to that town and buy wool, take it to France, manufacture it, bring it to Bradford in a manufactured state, and the cost would be less than if the wool had been manufactured in Bradford itself. In Russia, India, America, and on the Continent they have been supplied with machinery by us, and they have got English workpeople and English managers and overlookers to some extent. And so they meet us in many of our foreign markets and compete with us on advantageous terms. England may not have the world to manufacture for in the future as it has had in the past. And so English workmen should be careful not to drive trade away from our country by strike after strike. When trade is gone from us it is very apt to stay away, like a river which in floodtimes or by upheaval makes a new channel for itself, and which is very apt to forsake the old channel and not to return to the original river-bed again. So when trade gets into other hands, and the purchasers are perfectly satisfied, they are very likely to continue purchasing from the same quarter after the strikes in England are settled, and the trade may never again get into the old grooves. The common remark throughout the country made by all working men is this, "Well, but foreigners cannot produce our quality of goods; the work is of an inferior quality." But let working men consider that men

in other countries have heads and hands, and that as "practice makes perfect," foreign workmen may by-and-by rival and even surpass British workmen. Technical education is in advance of us on the Continent; and the taste of foreign workmen is superior to the taste of English workmen. We may have some advantage over other nations in coal and climate and inventive skill; but we must not trust to these things alone. American calicoes are sold in Manchester, equal to if they do not surpass the calicoes made on the spot. Manufactured iron of every description and for every purpose is got from Belgium. We get doors and window-frames ready-made from the same place. In some of the shops in China they refuse to sell our goods; and expose placards with this inscription, "No English goods sold here." With strikes on the one hand, and adulterated goods on the other, the prospect is not very encouraging for the future, and we shall probably never have the same trade with other nations in time to come that we have had in times past. Again and again we have heard in recent years that manufacturers have said, "We had such and such orders and we refused to take them." The astonished listeners asked the reason, and got this significant reply, "The moment the workmen knew that the contract was signed they would have struck for an increase of wages."

If trades unionists have the idea that they can compel masters to do as working men like it is a fearful mistake, and is probably in the end more calculated to punish artisans than their employers. If again they imagine that they can bring about equality in the conditions and remuneration of labour, it is another blunder for which

they themselves will ultimately suffer most. Trades unionists may say "If we do not take care of our inferior and incompetent brother workmen, what is to become of such poor weak men?" We reply that they are to be taken care of not as workmen, but as human brothers. We have sometimes said to working men in different parts of the country, "If you yourselves were masters would you employ Brown at the same wage that you would give Jones?—Brown is a poor fellow without head and Jones is clever and ingenious." At once working men have replied, "No." We have said, "You know hosts of working men who are not worth half as much as other working men are;" and they have immediately admitted the fact. "And yet," we have continued, "you want to force masters to pay incompetent workmen as much as competent workmen, a thing on your own confession which you would not do yourselves if you were masters—an unfair and unreasonable thing like that is not likely to answer long in the very nature of things. It is not only unfair to masters but also unfair to clever workmen. It keeps the capable men at the bottom of the social ladder, and instead of brains being an advantage to a man they are no advantage at all."

We remember putting the following case to a trades-unionist delegate, a clever intelligent man, and a man of Christian principle and profession: Mr. Smith had a bricklayer who did not belong to the union, and the other bricklayers who did were perpetually annoying the non-unionist. Mr. Smith heard of the annoyance one day, and said to the man, "Oh, join the union." The man did so. In a few days Mr. Smith found the man whistling and

dancing on the scaffolding of the building, instead of being at work as usual, and said to the man, "How is this, James?" "Oh," said James, "you know I belong to the trades union now. I did not want to join them, but you persuaded me to do so; and I have finished my quantity of bricks, and they will not let me have any more." Mr. Smith declared that James was the best workman he had, and the trades union brought him down to the level of the poorest. "Yes," replied the trades-unionist delegate, "but you must not put a bell-horse first to lead on all the rest; it would not be fair to the others to force them to go as fast and to do as much as the best man in the lot." But we ask is it fair to the best man to keep him down like that? If he can do more work than the rest with ease to himself, let him do it, and let the master pay the man more for it. Why object to the principle of free trade in labour, and yet contend for it in religion and in the commercial transactions of nations? We have said to delegates accustomed to take part in legislating for and managing trades unions, "Why not at least master the elements of Political Economy, if you will deal with trades unions?" Mostly, so far as our experience and observations go, such persons merely study the rights of labour. Economic laws do not disturb their mental repose; and consequently they blunder their own affairs and the affairs of their fellow workmen. When we have come across a few Christian and well-informed working men, we have said, "Why do you men submit to be dragged into strike after strike; you know it is against your interest, and the community justly expect better things from you; you are just the men to save the weaker and less intelligent

working men from committing social suicide." The reply has often been remarkable. "We know and see it all; we talk in the meetings, but we are helpless. We are outvoted by the dissolute who do not want to work, and by single men and apprentices who have not a family to care for. And yet it is not comfortable to work with the men around us unless we remain in the union." This has been the frank statement of one group of thoughtful men after another in county after county for the last twelve or fifteen years, till the impression made on our mind is that at least in some instances trades unions have become a terrible tyranny. We cannot say from reading or from intercourse with working men that it is so in all cases. We sincerely hope and incline to believe that it is not.

Working men say in self-defence that it is the tyranny of the masters, in the first instance, which led to the formation of trades unions. Masters, they contend, saw that a good workman could earn so much by doing a certain amount of work; and so the masters required all round that so much work should be done for so much money. Now working men maintain that a good workman with superior machinery could live on the terms, but that an inferior workman with inferior machinery could not live on the terms. Again they say that some masters are such monsters as to take every possible advantage of their workpeople, and the workpeople have to combine to protect themselves. We are not in a position to investigate these charges against masters; but we do not doubt that there is some truth in them. We do not for one moment think that all the virtue is on the side of the

masters, any more than that all the virtue is on the side of the workmen. But we do not believe that either masters or men are monsters, taken as a whole. There may be exceptions in both classes; but we prefer regarding both masters and men as average human beings, neither better nor worse than other ordinary men. And so we think matters may be settled on a more rational principle than by strikes and lock-outs. If masters tyrannise over work-people, strikes meet the masters' tyranny by a double tyranny—a tyranny over the masters and over the work-people at the same time. Surely there is a more reasonable and Christian way of meeting all difficulties between masters and men. Things are never so bad but they may be arranged by arbitration, involving, it may be, mutual concession or compromise, which mostly goes to the very heart of the matter, as there is generally wrong on both sides. But we would especially deal with the terrible struggle between capital and labour by teaching Political Economy, and by disseminating the principles of Christian sociology. With better information people will act differently.

We think England has suffered more from Socialism than any European nation, because as a practical people we are more disposed to carry theories to their logical conclusion, as we have done in repeated strikes and lock-outs. And the suffering of our country means the suffering of working men, as well as of the employers of labour and of shopkeepers; in fact, it means loss to the whole community. But perhaps the greatest and most serious loss from strikes and contentions about terms is the loss of the operative. We have to plead with working men to save them from themselves. They are, we conceive, their

own greatest enemies. Personally we have nothing to gain and nothing to lose by the course we are adopting. Our only apology is that we have the just interests of all classes at heart, and if one more than another, that of working men. We have seen from extensively moving among the working classes such fearful suffering, as well as read the accounts in the newspapers, that we positively dread the occurrence of strikes. They mean awful deprivations for wives and little ones, and then, after losing more than would be got by years of toil if all they asked from the master were granted, going in at the price they turned out at. But this is a large question, calling for patient thought both from masters and workmen.

It is asked by many what is the remedy for the awful state of things at present existing in Britain and in Europe. The Irish, led on by members of Parliament, are asking for the complete abolition of landlordism. At a monster Land League demonstration which took place at Kilkenny, October, 1880, Mr. Parnell said: "I am one of those who believe the institution of landlordism, with such a history as it has in Ireland, cannot possibly survive; and I think that the Irish people would do well to devote all their energies to its extirpation. . . . Let then your power be directed to the purpose of bringing about a national system of land tenure in Ireland; do not waste your resources in trying to prop up landlordism, but ask for your rights; and your right is that the man who tills the soil may own it." He may own it if he purchase it; but if he cannot purchase it, is he to steal it or to take it by force? Is Providence likely to smile on a proceeding of this kind? Clearly whatever be the true remedy for the woes

and wrongs of Ireland, this is not. And intelligent men are incurring a grave responsibility by leading the poor ignorant suffering Irish to adopt one act of injustice to correct what they regard as another act of injustice perpetrated long years ago. Christian Sociology points to a different method and to another solution of the difficulty. Neither the ills of Ireland nor of any other country will be cured by one sweeping measure and in a single session of Parliament. People as well as legislation must come back to the laws of nature and the laws of God from which they have departed. If Roman Catholicism were out of the way, and the New Testament religion had a fair chance, Ireland would probably soon see a brighter day. But wild schemes have been the curse of Ireland from generation to generation. Let the friends of Ireland, in and out of Parliament, come to something which is reasonable and practicable, and not everlastingly fling themselves and a bleeding nation against the laws of right, and expect to succeed in unjust measures by force. Murder and physical force will only postpone the regeneration of the "fair island of sorrows."

What again, it is asked, is the true remedy for the fearful struggle between capital and labour, and for the numerous strikes and lock-outs which occur? The first condition of terminating these social wars is a desire to do right on the part of masters and men. If either masters or men be unreasonable and selfish they must suffer, and there is no help for it that we can see; for God Himself does not coerce men into the doing of what is right. He appeals to their reason and conscience, and then leaves them to their better feelings and judgment. Can we

possibly adopt a better method than God's? The *Northern Echo* suggests a reasonable way out of some of the grave difficulties of the present struggle, and recommends a plan tried by Mr. Briggs, of Whitwood, many years ago, which is in principle co-operation.

"What, then, is the open secret whereby industrial disputes can be settled without strikes? It is not merely arbitration, although arbitration has much to do with it. It is arbitration, and more besides. Arbitration is the last and crowning stage in a long series, and the more its scope is minimised, and the less frequently it is resorted to, the more chance there is of a settlement of industrial disputes without an interruption of industrial operations. Arbitration is indispensable as a last resort, but only as a last resort; and the less it is resorted to the better. To say this is not to disparage arbitration, any more than it is to discredit a supreme Court of Appeal by saying that the fewer appeals there are to its supreme decision from the lower courts the better. The mistake of workmen in other districts is that they grasp at arbitration as if it supersedes all other methods of settling disputes, instead of being an invaluable reserve which can never be so profitably resorted to as when all other means have been tried and found wanting. The fundamental idea upon which the settlement of wage disputes without strikes is based in the coal and iron trades in the counties of Durham and Northumberland is that workmen and employers are partners in a common concern, in whose prosperity they have a direct and immediate interest. The principle on which the division of profits between the partners in the concern is based is stated briefly, that wages should follow prices.

Although there are many circumstances which tend to impair the accuracy of the supposition that the employer is making a larger profit because he is receiving a higher price for his manufactures, as a general rule it is not unsafe to assume that higher prices mean higher profits, and in these increased profits the workmen have a recognised right to share. To secure the satisfactory working of this partnership idea it is necessary that the masses of the workmen should be represented by a small committee, empowered to act with their authority and in their name, with whom a committee of the employers can confer on all questions that arise from time to time. They can seek a ratification of their decisions as often as they please, but the essential point is that there should be such a recognised representative standing committee, the members of which rapidly acquire not only a sense of responsibility but an acquaintance with the facts of the situation impossible to chance delegates elected in hugger-mugger fashion on the eve of a strike in a tumultuous meeting in a pothouse. The employers, on the other hand, lay before their workmen, frankly and without reserve, the exact facts as to the prices they are receiving. Accountants, sworn to secrecy, examine the books of selected firms, and report the average prices received in the preceding quarter for the commodities actually delivered in that period. By aid of the statistics so obtained, the settlement of wage questions becomes in many cases automatic. Even where no arrangement is made for the automatic rise and fall of wages in fixed proportion to prices the discussion of wage disputes is cleared of the greatest obstacle to an amicable settlement, a radical disagreement as to prices actually obtained. The

joint committees of masters and men in most cases can by mutual discussion arrive at an understanding, but if they fail they can, and frequently do, refer the question to the decision of one or two representatives of each side, who are empowered, in case of disagreement, to refer the ultimate residuum still in dispute to the decision of an arbitrator. That is the system which has worked admirably in the northern iron and coal field, and which would work admirably elsewhere if the operatives and their employers would adopt it. Strikes would not disappear instantaneously, it is true, but a final end would be placed to that deplorable industrial system which oscillates between a strike and a lock-out, and occasionally results in Blackburn riots and a social war."

At the Leicester Church Congress, 1880, some sensible deliverances were made on the Church and the organisation of labour.

"The subject was divided into two branches: (1) trade and labourers' unions and masters' associations, and (2) sanitary conditions of labour. The Bishop of Winchester presided. The first paper was read by the Rev. V. H. Stanton (Cambridge), who urged that moral considerations ought to influence the feelings of employers and employed towards each other, and that such considerations might contribute elements towards the solution of the present industrial difficulties. He strongly advocated the settlement of wage disputes by arbitration, and said public opinion might rightly enforce this by all the pressure it was able to exert. Mr. W. F. Fox (Nottingham), who read the second paper, urged that the clergy should not be partisans, denouncing trades unions as an unmitigated evil, nor

should they follow the example of those who seemed to encourage and promote them. He urged that the clergy should introduce the teaching of political economy into their schools, and should circulate in their libraries and reading-rooms the valuable handbooks written on the subject, as a means of getting rid of conflicts between capital and labour. He asked that the clergy should set forth in their life and doctrine the true Christian equality, which did not ignore the differences of social position, that true Christian liberty which was free from the caprice of masters or the tyranny of trade unions, and let them proclaim in the name of God the universal brotherhood of man."

We see nothing but Christian sense and Christian principle that will harmonise all interests, and reconcile masters and men in the protracted struggle between capital and labour. Ministers of religion and Christian people generally may aid the good cause; and it behoves all who can in any way influence contending parties for good to do so. When public opinion has grown thoughtful and wise; when the non-contending parties have mastered the problem more thoroughly than is the case to-day; when our mind as outsiders is fairly and fully made up as to what is the best course to adopt, we think the struggle may soon be over. We do not see that any cause can live long in this age against enlightened public conviction. Both masters and men must be prepared to sacrifice whatever is unreasonable and opposed to the welfare and happiness of society generally. Persons may regret the loss of monopolies and protection, but they are for ever doomed; and right and truth and justice must and will reign in

society, till all are made true and loving brothers in the kingdom and patience of Jesus.

A step in the right direction was advocated by Sir U. J. Kay-Shuttleworth, at the Social Science Congress, Edinburgh, 1880.

"Having suggested to the council of the association that the time had come when they ought to endeavour to enlist the co-operation of working men by holding sectional meetings each evening of the annual congress, said he believed that they would get more useful suggestions from labour than from capital as to the best means of improving the social condition of the community by adopting such terms of admission as were within the reach of working men, and by discussing questions in which they were specially interested. Speaking of the relations of capital and labour, he said he believed that in Scotland they had, happily, few of those wars between capital and labour commonly called strikes. In Lancashire they had, unfortunately, had several of those wars, and they had recently had threats of others. He should like to say a few words as to how those industrial conflicts might possibly be averted. The working men of Lancashire had a habit of letting things come to a fearful pass between themselves and their employers, and then submitting to a mass meeting of operatives the question, "Strike or no strike?" That was very much like the French plebiscite, and the result was that the mass of young men and young women had a greater voice in the momentous question of war or peace than the older, and possibly the wiser, heads amongst the operatives. Surely it would be much better if a committee were appointed, to whom the question of "Strike

or no strike" could be referred. If the committee came to a decision which was manifestly out of accord with the general feeling of the working classes, they could throw the committee over, and decide according to the best of their judgment; but if the question were left to a committee, he ventured to think that the outbreak of war would be less frequent. There was a committee of masters and a committee of weavers, but each met in secret conclave and apart from the other. They did not meet until they were at war, or almost at war, and then one party advanced to the other, but the advance was made in a tone of "Stand and deliver." How much better it would be if those people were to meet constantly, not merely at the moment when things had got to such a pitch that conciliation was impossible, but at times when things were smooth, and when difficulties were beginning to arise. If the representatives of the masters and the representatives of the men could sit together and examine the facts of the case, how much better it would be. The greatest interest of the men was continuity of employment at fair wages. Questions between nations unfortunately were too often ultimately settled by the arbitrament of a war, but they all admitted that mediation was desirable between nations; and if that were so, still more was it desirable when the question to be decided was not between two countries, but between capital and labour, whose interests, in truth, were not hostile to each other, but identical."

The method of preventing strikes advocated by the honourable baronet is essentially the method adopted in the north of England, and advocated in the *Northern Echo*, as already quoted. The idea of evening sections,

connected with the Social Science Congress, especially for working men, for the purpose of discussing questions of trade and economy, we think could only be productive of immense good. We have always advocated the instruction of men. Enlighten and convince first; for without this all else will be useless and worthless socially. We do not say that all selfishness will disappear when people are taught what is for the public good. Christian grace is necessary to accomplish the destruction of selfishness. But ignorance must be destructive of social good. So that one of the first steps is to teach the people the laws of commerce and the fundamental principles of society. How can we expect working men to understand these things unless we teach them? Many masters do not understand questions of this nature; but we must be patient with them, for they have risen from the ranks, and have been occupied with the one question of making their own way in the world. For the last fifteen years we have patiently pleaded that sociology might be taught the people; we have seen the views embodied in the first edition of this work taken up at Church Congresses and Social Science Congresses, and in books; and though in some cases the similarity has been striking, we can only say that it is encouraging to find the general interest now taken in the subject.

Christianity we believe will produce all that Socialism attempts, but in another and in a far better way. But Christians will have to consider that property has its duties as well as its interests and its privileges. The Christian Church will have to teach the people how to develop and sustain the whole being in the best way; that is, the whole

material and spiritual interests of man as connected with this and the world to come. Because the Church in the past has failed to educate man for both worlds, failed to train man effectually for the present life as well as for the future life, are not we to-day being punished by great and terrible social evils? It is for the Christians of this age to consider this matter carefully and prayerfully before God. Will the time ever come when all these great social evils will be uprooted and destroyed? We believe it will. But if ever such a period arrive in the history of the race it will be brought about by Christianity. All else fails. Christianity alone has power to produce that voluntary devotion to the welfare of the people which will overcome selfishness, self-seeking, idleness, injustice, untruthfulness, and all the formidable evils which stand in the way of the true social elevation of the people.

Dr. Huntington says: "Plutarch, in his life of Lycurgus, gives an account of the attempts of that legislator to throw the landed property of the nation into common stock, and then equalise it. The project originated, apparently, in a benevolent purpose; but it resulted in a miserable despotism. The Spartan had no household, no home. If allowed to marry at all, his married life was still subject to public supervision. The State watched and controlled him; and what the State wanted was to breed warriors. If the sight of their children made fathers too tender-hearted for that, they must either not beget children, or not live with them, or refuse to see them. Among the free citizens there must be no commerce, no dealings in money. All traffic and artisanship were handed over to the Helots. It was a tremendous piece of coercion; a strange mixture of

Socialism and tyranny,—a model not likely to find copies." Robert Owen tried to supersede Christianity, and entered upon a great experiment at New Lanark, on the Clyde, which proved a miserable failure. Even the temporary success is mainly attributable to the practical sagacity of his father-in-law. Mr. Owen made another experiment in America; but soon returned across the sea disgusted to ponder another failure. Mr. Owen made his experiment in New Harmony, Indiana; and in a neighbouring state, Illinois, in more recent times another experiment was made by Cabet. The followers of Cabet found the Icarian Eden "a desert, a few ruined huts, and an abundance of graves." "There is no slavery," said one of them, "so hard as Communism in action." Louis Blanc's theory on the organisation of labour failed when it was tried. The fifteen hundred tailors set to work had no motives strong enough to make them hurry their fingers without a probability of reaping some direct personal advantage. Louis Blanc puts the double formula in this way:—"From every one according to his aptitudes; to every one according to his needs." Proudhon says, "Please Mr. Louis Blanc, who is to judge of the capacity, and of the wants? You say that my capacity is one hundred; I maintain that it is only ninety. You say that my need is ninety; I maintain that it is one hundred. Here we are differing by twenty as to need and the capacity. Who is to be umpire between the society and me? If the society enforces its opinion, I quit, and your association is broken. Or if I stay and succumb, your principle is broken."

Probably if any known scheme of Socialism were allowed a full and fair trial for the next ten years, allowed to work

out all its ideas and principles without interference or restraint from Government, or organisations, or individuals, it would be productive of as great or greater misery in society than at present exists anywhere. Socialism does not properly recognise the evil in human nature, and provide effectually for that evil. It tries to bring about its changes, and to perfect its organisations by purely natural means, so it fails.

Now the method of Christianity is to deal with individuals. Socialism deals with systems. Christianity says, first make the tree good and the fruit will be good. It takes proper account of the fact that "an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit." Men in their methods do not go down to the cause of the social mischief, do not get at the real disturbing elements in society. They leave the evil in human nature untouched, and so hew out a broken cistern that holds no water. While people are left in all their evil no social system will do, however good it may be; though a good system is under any circumstances better than a bad one.

Men seek happiness by social equality; that is, happiness in a system. Christianity seeks the happiness of the individual, and by this method seeks the happiness of the race. Socialistic dreamers assert that happiness "is our being's end and aim;" and so we are in all things to follow our own inclinations unreservedly, in order that we may really fulfil our mission. To suppress the inclinations is only to produce pain, and it must therefore, they conclude, be wrong. They say, "interests correspond to destiny, from the series springs harmony." But social disharmonies will only cease by the destruction of selfishness,

and the culture of the Christian virtues. Happiness, moreover, is not the end of man, but righteousness. We are to be in all things not first happy, but right. "Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

It is thought by some socialists that when "universal education has caused universal good manners, and all classes mix with one another with ease and cordiality," class antagonism will cease, and paradise will be restored. Class hatred is the Ishmaelite in the brotherhood of men; but how education, however good and right and desirable it may be in itself, is to make the lion lie down peacefully with the lamb, we utterly fail to see. The tree of knowledge is not the tree of life. We must go to Christianity to learn that the world by wisdom knew not God, and never can. Secular knowledge will never elevate society in purity and righteousness. We think education will do much for the poor, and we truly rejoice in what is being done by a national system of education; but we are sure that Christianity is essential to make people virtuous, and to bind class to class.

The method of Socialism is to level down, the method of Christianity is to level up. Nothing but individual goodness, intelligence, and industry will improve society effectually. All else so far has failed to improve the social condition of the people. There are still great social evils and disharmonies, notwithstanding all that has been done by the social reformers of past centuries. "Well, what has Christianity done?" it will be said. It has elevated the people who have accepted it, in ideas, in tastes, and in the principles of action. It has led to the establishment of humane laws, philanthropic institutions, day and Sabbath

school education, and the ten thousand ameliorating influences of civilised life. And were Christianity allowed fully to operate in human society, it would totally destroy nine-tenths of the evils which now afflict the race: if it thought in the thinking of men, felt in the feeling of men, acted in the acting of men; if the inner and outer man became completely Christ-like in principle and motive, idea and deed; then the age of which poets have sung, and orators have spoken, and prophets have prophesied, would soon be realised. Indeed a grander age would be actually seen than social dreamers ever dreamt of, than all the Utopias describe, or than ever entered into the heart of man to conceive apart from Christianity. As it is Christianity has made the Christendom of to-day the Christendom that it is; it has blest the individual, the family, the State; it has given freedom, quickened intellect, and given man the possession of himself. All that is noble, just, and good in society we trace back to Christianity. And though some are proclaiming morality apart from the Gospel, they got their very ideas from the Bible indirectly through literature and science, and the moral notions floating everywhere in Christendom; and so these very people publishing what they call a natural morality are only offering stolen goods.

But it will be said Christianity has been in the world for nearly two thousand years, and it has hitherto failed to bring society under its regulative influence. That is perfectly true. But let us remember that Christianity began with twelve men, and that the twelve have grown into hundreds of millions. Reasoning from the past, there is rational hope for the future. Without armies, without

governments, in fact with governments and armies against it, with scholars and philosophers against it, with kings and peoples against it; by its own inherent power Christianity has won its way so far, and is likely to triumph most completely in the end. If that poor young carpenter of Nazareth, without powerful patrons, without being educated in any of the schools of the day, without the sword of secular power, could change public opinion and create Christendom, His work must be of God, and will ultimately prevail.

CHAPTER III.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

LOOKING at this subject in its social relations the doctrine of human brotherhood becomes exceedingly important. Notwithstanding the difference of politics, the difference of mental culture, and the difference of material interests, there is a mighty bond of oneness in humanity which is universally felt, making man brother to man all the world over. Dean Stanley says in his inaugural address at Oxford, as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, "Universal history has enriched our language with a word that never passed the lips of Plato, Socrates, or Aristotle,—the word *mankind*. Where the Greek saw barbarians, we see brethren. Where he saw heroes and demigods, we see parents and ancestors. Where he saw nations, we see mankind many ways severed, but moving to one destiny, and bearing one image of God; as where the ancient astronomic observer saw separate spheres in the sky, we see a single system, balanced in itself and harmonised by one central attraction."

When we look at the nature, origin and historical development of society, we at once perceive the wisdom, power and goodness of God in its structure. It is clearly of Divine appointment and essential to bring out and develop the capacities of man, his reason, will, conscience, and affections; his faith, hope, self-denial, heroism, zeal,

and moral energy. Man is of necessity a social being. The Creator never meant us to live alone. Our nature was given us for social intercourse, duties, and enjoyments. Society springs out of the Divine will and arrangement. It is not a mere compact, not a league between man and man, but the Creator's wise and gracious appointment. You cannot shut out the Almighty from the organisation of society, and His blessed book is the key to complete social order.

According to Dr. Huntington, in his *Divine Aspects of Human Society*, "Society is simply human nature existing in its natural combinations. It is all the faculties of man in one mode of their exhibition,—reason, will, conscience, affection. Only consider the combination is such that humanity itself could not be complete without it. There are capacities in man to which society is just as necessary as light to the eye or food to the body" (p. 6). Again he says, on the next page, "It is the coexistence of men, and families of men, on terms of mutual intercourse for certain common ends, under the providence of God."

There are two opposing theories respecting the origin of society—one that it is perfectly human, the other that it is really Divine. There was first the family, then the tribe, and afterwards the State; the family, or parents and children; the tribe, or the association of families; the State, or society organised and governed by law. But all is traceable to God. He is seen in the origin and progress of the family, the tribe, and the State. All legitimate authority is from God. We must always recognise the Divine sovereignty in the domain of ideas. If we consult reason and conscience on this subject, they harmonise with

Scripture. In the family, in the Church, in the nation, God is supreme. We are not safe in social, political, and ecclesiastical arrangements unless we take the Bible as our guide, and look at all human rights and interests as founded on the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures. Not the will of kings, not the will of peoples, but the will of Him who has created and redeemed us. Civil and social authority must be regarded as alike founded on the will of God. We do not speak of the divine right of kings, or of the divine right of peoples. Forms of government are not taught in the Bible. But government as such is undoubtedly of God, as society could not possibly exist without it. All power, whether absolute, limited monarchy, oligarchy, republican, or personal, is held *in trust:* all who wield power of any kind on earth are responsible to God.

If it be asked, What is the foundation of the rights of man? We say what but the will and arrangement of God as made known to us in Scripture? And this leads to the further inquiry, Is it not the will of God that the body should be fed and clothed, that the life of the body should be sacredly preserved and guarded? Is it not more especially the will of God that the mental and spiritual life should be cared for and protected against all evil influences? Should not the mind be enlightened and instructed, furnished with the means and opportunity of free and full development? For the soul to be without knowledge is not good; so that while the State provides for the secular education of the people, the Church must attend to their Christian instruction. Society is bound to care for the whole man, for the entire moral and material interests of each human being.

The charter of human rights is the Bible; and the Bible correctly interpreted claims for us all that is reasonable and necessary. Taking our stand on God's book as the peoples' bill of rights, we have more granted us than any social reformer ever yet proposed, more than any philosopher ever yet propounded in his system of teaching, and more than any ancient or modern government ever yet gave to the people. The Bible does not give us a form of human government, and decide that that shall be the one type of government for all the nations and all ages of the world. It does something immensely grander by furnishing laws and principles for the guidance of peoples and legislators. Nor does it greatly matter what the form of government is if the principles of procedure be thoroughly Scriptural.

Adam Smith says something to this effect in *The Wealth of Nations:* "The happiness of the people depends not so much upon the share the people have in making the laws under which they live, as in the nature of the laws that govern them." Only give us God's book as the basis of the laws of a nation, and you may then baptise the government by the name of republic, oligarchy, limited monarchy, despotism, or whatever else you please. We care but little for names and parties, but we care a great deal about principles and things. We do not mean principles and things in the mind merely, or on a statute-book, but worked out and acted upon in daily life.

When we speak of society, we do not mean the lowest possible development of humanity to be found in any State or country; we mean society with its highest and noblest exhibition of virtue and intelligence, its loftiest

ideas, its grandest educational forces, its purest influences, and its most benevolent associations. We know we must come to Christianity to obtain this condition of things, and we willingly and gladly accept the religion of Jesus as the most potent force in existence for the elevation of society. It is impossible to treat this subject fully and faithfully without a distinct recognition of the Gospel. The brotherhood of men would be singularly incomplete without the mightiest element in it acknowledged and analysed. Christianity forms the noblest characters, leads up to the highest attainments of humanity. As man is a religious being, his character must always remain imperfect without the Gospel. And we should do a positive injustice to the subject under consideration, not to make this frank statement with regard to the power of godliness in social life. Society is the expression and embodiment of a Divine idea, a thought conceived in the mind of God and illustrated in the history of individuals, families, commonwealths, and Churches. Society is held together by certain laws. It exists under law, and is developed according to law. We speak not so much of natural law, though its influence in the formation of society is undoubted and great. No community ever became great and lasting without some favourable natural conditions. Climate and soil have much to do in building up empires. But we speak more especially of social and moral laws. These laws do and will operate—operate in spite of us. If theft and murder be committed, or any kind of gross immorality be indulged in, the peace and comfort of society are sacrificed and its well-being is to some extent destroyed. The social rights and interests of our brother man cannot be ignored

with impunity. Man cannot indulge in all sorts of evil, and especially in flagrant moral inconsistency, without bringing misery and often ruin upon himself and others. We do not exist here on earth as so many individual independencies. We are all connected like links in a chain. One man has not a little world to himself, in which he can live and act without influencing for good or for evil his fellow-men. No, men everywhere and always possess influence, which either consciously or unconsciously makes itself felt. The effects of a man's influence, of his social and moral recklessness, are sometimes flung back upon himself and employed as the instrument of his personal punishment. In other instances "the iniquities of the fathers are visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." By influence and example as well as by hereditary taint, moral depravity and social corruption are transmitted to posterity. In this way the chaste manners and godly principles of generation after generation have been sacrificed. A bad man is a social curse; a good man is a social blessing. In social life we have the awful power of making people worse than they are instead of better; the power of tempting, misleading, degrading them morally. But, thank God, we have also the power of making people better. As man by social influences may become exalted and ennobled, so by social excitements he may be made tenfold more the child of hell than before.

Now we hold that society is God's ordination, and that means and influence are talents given by God, and given with the design that in each instance they shall be faithfully employed for God's glory and our brother's good. Means, opportunities, and abilities we take to be the mea-

sure of human responsibility. "To him that knoweth to do good,"—according to the means, opportunities and abilities with which the Almighty has blest him—"and doeth it not, to him it is sin." If our gifts and social influence are perverted, in that case we are morally culpable before our Maker. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Not think on them as mere matters of speculation or principles on which to build social theories; but think on them practically, so that your living among men may not be a moral blight, but an unspeakable blessing. We are in no case to follow a multitude to do evil, but under obligation to abstain from evil both in principle and appearance. So strictly must the life be governed, that our brother's interests shall never in any way be damaged by us. Even the law of Christian liberty is limited by the law of brotherly consideration and charity. And our fellow-man is something more than a mere human brother; he is a redeemed and immortal brother too. Of the same flesh and blood, but like ourselves destined to live for ever in heaven or hell. And as certainly as we live in his society here we shall live in his society hereafter. His immortal interests must therefore be cared for, as well as his social and temporal well-being.

Here then it is evident that men act and react on one another. Influence goes on accumulating continually. Evil so to speak propagates itself; and good multiplies evermore. Whither our deeds may reach and what they may

effect we none of us know. But while others are blest by our good works we are most blest; and while others are cursed by our evil works we are most cursed. The reaction on ourselves in evil cases is fearful to contemplate. And let us not lose sight of the fact that we are not merely responsible for the influence we now exercise on society, but also for posthumous influence. Existence becomes very important when we look at it in this light.

One fundamental principle of Christian Sociology *is the universal obligation to utter and to adhere to truth.* At the cost of life or property or popularity, we should always utter and adhere to what is strictly true. Not malign and misrepresent our brother. He who does this has something of the reptile about him. We can understand and sincerely respect a man who openly and honestly declares that he cannot think with us; we can love and admire the man. But the public and private slanderer of his fellows is not a man,—he belongs to the generation of vipers! The book of God tells us that we are to "speak evil of no man," and that "he that uttereth a slander is a fool,"—and no common fool either, for everybody knows that he would slander them too if the occasion and opportunity served. Evil-speaking is moral murder. It destroys the good name and character of a brother against the command of Him who says, "Thou shalt not kill;" thou shalt neither kill the body nor the influence nor the reputation of a brother man. Darkly to insinuate suspicious things of a man is the worst kind of falsehood, as it leaves people to imagine anything and everything that is bad. Better knock a man down on the highway and steal his purse. He would have some chance of defending himself. But the secret and anonymous

slanderer of his fellows is an invisible robber. He steals more than material property. "He who steals my purse steals trash; but he who filches my good name, takes that which not enriches him, but leaves me poor indeed!" And remember truth is a thing that enters into the purposes and intentions of the mind. A lie is somewhere defined by Dr. Watts as "an intention to deceive." Truth on the other hand is the faithful and conscientious representation of things as they are. You may act a lie, or tell one with a wink, look, or nod. It is not always necessary distinctly to syllable or whisper your meaning. Actions speak and looks have a language easily understood. And there are men of such consummate wickedness that their whole procedure is a dark and dirty libel on their fellows, a practical lie against those associated with them in business, profession, literature, or toiling with them in the same workshop. They dare not speak out their meaning in plain and intelligible words for fear of legal proceedings; but they effectually communicate that meaning by the expression of the countenance and by their daily conduct. A shrug of the shoulders, a tone of the voice, a contemptuous act; a thousand ways and methods of telling untruth are available to a malignant spirit. You may never speak a word and yet effectually blight a man's character and ruin his prospects for life. Or you may half state a case and leave a false impression on the mind, because of what you have intentionally suppressed.

"And the parson made it his text that week, and he said likewise,
That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies;
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight."

But as in any business transaction there must be two to a bargain, according to the proverbial language of the times,—so in all cases of evil-speaking there are two parties concerned, and the listener is every bit as bad as the speaker, the receiver as bad as the thief. All falsehood has something hellish about it; it is of the devil; he is a liar from the beginning, the father of lies and of liars, having a numerous and terrible progeny. But truth is of God, Divine in its origin, and heavenly in its tendency. It binds society together and makes men happy brothers. Whereas evil-speaking and misrepresentation separate chief friends and make earth resemble hell.

Another fundamental principle of Christian Sociology is universal *justice between man and man.* Persons may be placed in difficult circumstances strictly and universally to observe this law of human brotherhood. But the law must be kept. The Gospel does not accommodate itself to peculiar cases, does not allow men to neglect this duty because of special positions in society. Without exception it enjoins justice upon every person in every social condition. Men everywhere are required to do justly, as well as to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God. What they would that others should do to them, they are bound to do toward others. Herein people must exercise themselves to have a conscience void of offence toward God and man. These are some of the cardinal laws of human conduct, the principal rules by which we are to be guided in our actions toward our brother men. There is to be no disposition, no attempt whatever to lower the exalted standard of Christian morality. If our practice falls below the Christian standard we must

blame ourselves, not the Gospel. We cannot and must not dare to attempt to alter that sublime law of human procedure. It is given by the common Father of the race, enforced and expounded by Christ our Elder Brother. It is intended to regulate human dealings and intercourse down to the latest generations. It plainly informs us that we ought to conduct ourselves on the strictest principles of justice toward the property of men—not to defraud in any matter, and to owe no man anything (1 Thess. iv. 6, &c.); toward the character of men—to speak evil of no man (Titus iii. 2); and toward the person of men—to do violence to no man (Luke iii. 14). Indeed, "whatsoever things are just," as well as lovely and of good report, we must according to the injunction of the Apostle "think on these things," not as mere matters of curious speculation or idle amusement, but as the daily principles of procedure. If justice be considered in its distributive character, then magistrates and rulers must give right and equity to every man according to the laws and principles of equity. If justice be considered as commutative, then there must be fair dealing in trade, no taking advantage of the ignorance or necessity of others. You must give value for value, and not always act upon the popular law of commerce in these times—to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest—a law which in most circumstances is right and reasonable, but in others has in it an amount of selfish calculation that would oppress and starve one half of the human race. It means on the lips of the multitude, Make your fortune, forget your brother altogether; neglect his body and soul, if you have the chance of accumulating property

and growing rich out of his ruin. If such a law were strictly and universally acted on a needy and ignorant brother would not be able to live, and the millionaire would hold the lives of the people in his hand. We do not much believe in the immense accumulation of wealth in the hands of one man, while millions of the man's human brothers are perishing in destitution. Remember property has its duties as well as its rights and privileges. We should be just too in the expression of opinions, and endeavour in every case fairly and fully to represent the actual facts with reference to the merits or demerits of our opponents. In biography, history, or controversy we should do ample justice to every man, whether friend or foe; ay, we should be fair to the devil himself, which is seldom the case. And if people cannot get on in life by doing what is just and right, then let them have the courage honourably and righteously to fail, and let them and their children rather starve and beg their bread than thrive and prosper by evil deeds. It may be hard to flesh and blood to do so, but it will tell best when three-score years and ten have gone by. And the other life ought, we submit, to be looked at as well as this, since we are rapidly passing on to the grave and shall soon have to deal with eternal things.

A further fundamental principle of Christian Sociology is the universal *cultivation and exercise of a disinterested benevolence.* The command is clear and unmistakable, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." We are especially bound to imitate the benevolence of the Divine Father, which is promiscuous, and extends to the evil and unthankful as well as to the good. Judging from the

foregoing context this appears to be what is principally intended by the exhortation, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." As the love of family, friends and countrymen only implies a very imperfect likeness to God, we as the offspring of a Divine Father must imitate Him more closely and completely. Consequently we are to show mercy according to our ability and opportunity to all in suffering circumstances, our very enemies themselves not excepted. Creed, colour, clime, or condition in life must not limit our benevolence. "For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?" We are to show a purer and loftier morality, making as we do a profession of Christian discipleship. Nor must we always seek out worthy and deserving objects of our charity. The undeserving and unworthy must be pitied and relieved. Even though they may have brought themselves to suffering through their own folly and wickedness, we must help them and give them another chance, especially if there be any probability of improvement. It is just what our heavenly Father does, and we are to be imitators of Him, taking His conduct as the model of our own. We do not mean that you are to give imprudently. Such giving in our judgment does more harm than good. It pauperises the people, destroying the valuable principle of self-help. By self-reliance people can generally do more for themselves than the charitably disposed can do for them. If you wish to die in your bed at last, do not give to wandering beggars. They are the most depraved people in the whole land, living in fornication and adultery in the low lodging-houses of towns at night, and preying like wolves upon the

population of town and country during the day. It will be a grand day for England when mendicity is entirely ended. It is the helpless and the destitute who must be relieved, and not the professional beggar. "Is it not a sin and a shame," said Mr. Gathorne Hardy, now Lord Cranbrook, in one of his speeches a few years ago, "that there should be in this country forty or fifty thousand persons who do nothing but feed upon the industry of their fellow citizens, going from place to place like locusts, eating up the fruits of the country?" And there are multitudes of good Christian people who feed and clothe these professional mendicants, assisting them to go about spreading moral contagion, rather than take the trouble to seek out the poor and needy. The fatherless and widows are left alone in their helplessness and affliction, and the clamourous beggar gets what they should have. Now it is a principle of Christianity that if a man will not work neither shall he eat. Christianity does not undertake to define in what way a man shall work; but he must perform some kind of beneficial work for the commonwealth, either with hands or head or both. If a man cannot work, or cannot obtain employment, he and his in that case must live upon your bounty because he is your own brother. Like God we must learn to do good to all, and especially be charitable to those who are helpless and dependent. Our Father sets us a noble example. Sunshine and showers, light and heat, and the refreshing breezes of summer come freely to the just and unjust. The grass grows green, the flowers bloom, and the ten thousand beauties of nature are put forth for the evil and the good. The fountain sends forth its streams, and the earth yields its rich produce for the

righteous and unrighteous. And so we must cultivate and exercise an inexhaustible benevolence toward the converted and unconverted; "do good to all men, but especially to them who are of the household of faith," at the same time using our best judgment. As a man's family has the first claim upon the care of the man, so the poor of the Church have the first claim upon the charity of the Church. But the Church itself is not by any means to be the limit of the benevolence of the Church. All must be cared for and helped as far as we can do it. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And as every needy man is neighbour to him who has the means of assisting the necessitous, the man who is blest with this world's good is evidently to love his neighbour with more than a sentimental affection: it must be a substantial and practical love, a love like God's. Selfishness should be completely extinguished by Christianity. The religion of the benevolent Jesus should be the perfect death of all that is narrow and ungenerous, and the birth of a Godlike benevolence.

Urging you not to relieve beggars if you sincerely wish to aid the spread of Christianity and to bring the reign of social evil to an end, at first thought looks very cold and hard, and appears to be contrary to the tender loving spirit of Christ; but remember that it was no part of the policy of Jesus to assist impostors. He sent them away with a sharp rebuke; and it would be well for modern Christianity if it had in it more of the principle of manly justice, and less of maudlin sentimentality. We fear people mostly relieve professional beggars because it is a ready and easy way of being charitable. It is more difficult and troublesome to go and seek out the deserving

poor, or "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." And the feeling that you have neglected the duty of charity to the needy makes you present a peace-offering to conscience by relieving the first beggar who comes to your door. Take mendicants as a class, and you will find them to be the most efficient missionaries of social and moral evil in the whole of England. And by relieving mendicants you help them to do their evil work; you put it in their power to pollute and degrade your country.

Take the case of women begging with babies in their arms. This is a powerful appeal to the sympathies of all mothers and fathers especially. If these sympathising people knew everything, they would probably act very differently, and the poor women begging in the street would be well off if they escaped with a whole skin. Such women can take a poor baby, when there are too many in a family, and snugly put it out of the way by starving it to death in the streets. This too is a splendid way of killing off illegitimate children. The law of the land cannot touch these women; they are only guilty of legitimate murder. Or they can borrow children at so much per day, and at night live on the fruits of their imposture as the poor people cannot afford to live who have foolishly given bread and coppers. If the starved children do not die they live a lingering death, or they live to practise the same line of things, and then to hand down to others the same wretched habits, and so to perpetuate mendicity generation after generation as a most profitable business.

A man will set out in a morning on a begging expedition without shirt or shoes and stockings. The charitable help

him without stint. He gets cast-off clothing as well as money and bread. But he knows his game well, and so he turns aside and puts off the garments given him, and goes on in his original condition. It is worth five or seven shillings a day to a man to go begging without a shirt. The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon once gave a shoeless beggar a pair of patent leather boots. But Mr. Spurgeon said, "The man was not the fool I took him to be. When he had got round the corner he took them off and put them into his bag: and I saw it would never do for the man to go begging in patent leather boots."

"Well," some say, "we only give a bit of bread at the door, and so we are safe enough." Shall we give you a well-attested fact, which is only a sample of hundreds of others? At a shop door in Angel Meadow, Manchester, in the very height of the distress, in the fourth week in January, 1878, when it severely taxed all the energies and resources of the charitably-disposed to keep the bodies and souls of the poor suffering people together, there were twelve sacks of bread which had been purchased from beggars, and which were exposed for sale to feed pigs. A lay missionary thoroughly examined the bread to be sure that he was perfectly right in his knowledge of the matter, and he declared that it was as good bread as could be bought in any shop in Manchester. The innocent and charitable public would have been perfectly startled if those twelve sacks of bread could have spoken out and told the tale of their origin and destiny, whence they came and whither they were going, and what beer and spirits and good feeding had been got out of them by the much-pitied mendicants. And singular as this may appear

to some, it is but an illustration of what is going on all the year round all over the country. It may be taken as a general fact that bread given at the door is wasted, and money so given is spent in drink. There may be a few cases in which beggars begin to eat ravenously as they turn from the door of those who help them, but when they get round the corner they put the spoils in a bag, or they throw the good victuals over the hedge. We have followed mendicants and watched them closely in many counties of England, for our own satisfaction; and always with the same unvarying results, unless we happened to rouse suspicion. People generally will hardly be convinced of the evil of mendicity unless they make a special study of it as we have done for the last twelve or fifteen years; and so they will go on giving away bread and money, and thereby become partakers in other men's sins.

Whenever a new lay missionary was employed by the Manchester and Salford Wesleyan Lay Missionary Society, he was always deeply pained because he could not relieve the terrible distress around him. This feeling only lasted while he was fresh to the work; six months' experience cured the most tender-hearted and sympathising among them. They saw the uselessness and folly of helping people who were only assisted to continue in evil or to go deeper and deeper into sin. You can do no good but much harm by giving money to men and women unless they are prepared to reform and to help themselves.

We may appear to some to speak strongly on the subject of mendicity; but this is partly for reasons already stated and partly because we have had special opportunities for

looking into the subject in connection with the Leeds Social Improvement Society, and also in connection with the Manchester and Salford Wesleyan Lay Home Missionary Society. You can only stop mendicity by refusing to help on the roads and at the door, and by imprisoning impostors. These are hard measures, and people do not like to adopt them; but the severest measures are mostly the kindest in the end. The iron must enter the hearts of some who are lost to all virtue and dead to all shame, if ever they are to return to the ways of decency and goodness. Now God's method is to let such suffer till they respect and obey His law. We cannot possibly improve on the methods of God. But the very moment any one shows an inclination to reform we must be ready with our aid.

We wish that in all our great towns and cities we had an organisation like the Leeds Social Improvement Society, working side by side with the Board of Guardians; an organisation set on foot to suppress mendicity, and to relieve the deserving poor. In connection with the above "society" we gave the householders in the borough printed tickets, and requested them to give these tickets to beggars, and not to give bread or money. The mendicants brought these tickets to our office, our agents investigated the case; the impostors were prosecuted and the genuine cases were relieved. We did not take cases properly belonging to the poor law officers; we handed these over to the proper quarter; but we took the cases only requiring help for a few weeks, as we felt it was important if possible to keep decent hardworking unfortunate people from the feeling of pauperism. We soon made an impression on Leeds,

made the borough rather hot for beggars, and the public wondered what had become of the mendicants. We cannot say whether the "society" is so efficiently worked at present; but we see the need of a similar institution in all great centres of population.

It appears to be extremely necessary that the charities of the churches should be administered with greater care and on better methods. Giving to the needy from feeling without judgment does more harm than good; the remedy is often worse than the disease. Poor people are more injured than advantaged by ill-judged charity. And the same may be said of public charities as well as of the charities of the churches. It is commonly admitted that infirmaries and dispensaries associated with them are abused by many members of the community for whom such places were never intended. And instead of the poorest and most helpless being served by these public charities, people a little better off use them more than is just and reasonable in certain localities. We know it is very difficult to prevent abuses creeping into the best organisations; and the selfish everywhere grasp all they can, while wisdom and charity do not always go together.

A still further fundamental principle of Christian Sociology *is moral purity*. Christ said to His disciples, "Ye are the light of the world;" and He meant that their light as Christians was to be far greater than the light of mere worldly morality. Common-morality men may be induced to attend to the form of godliness, or to the mere conventional rules of society, from worldly or interested motives; and so they may effect mere outward goodness by the use of purely natural means. But

everybody can account for this; people see well enough upon what such conduct is founded; the reason of this good exterior is patent to the multitude. A man knows it is necessary to his success in life, necessary to accomplish his worldly purposes that he should be outwardly moral. Common decency itself requires that he should be sober, honest, truthful, and free from fornication and adultery and all the grosser crimes of the people. But Christianity comes to us and sternly demands far more than convenient morality. It provides for and requires in our daily living greater purity of principle. The general morality of the world does not inquire very carefully or strictly into the purity of a man's principles. Motives and principles are hardly ever looked into by the easy-going-morality men of our times. The men of the world are mostly satisfied with simply looking on the outside of human character and conduct. The spirit of the age is this: What have we got to do with judging a man's motives and principles? we have only to do with the actions of men. But the Christian religion regards the matter very differently. In Christianity nothing is worth the name of morality without purity of principle. The Great Searcher of hearts requires truth in the inward parts. Take away the exalted principle of Christianity and the religion of Jesus becomes a body without a soul; in fact it becomes useless and worthless. "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savour it is thenceforth good for nothing."

Christianity provides for and requires in our daily living higher degrees of personal purity than we find in the common morality of the times. The indulgences of

worldly morality are tolerably great; pretty liberally measured out to men. As a rule worldly morality is not very tight-laced. Such moralists are generally careful not to be righteous overmuch. But the self-denying character of Christianity cuts all sin up by the roots. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world." And he that offendeth in one point is guilty of the whole law; that is, he is as really and truly guilty before God as if he had actually violated every precept of the moral code. Christ says, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God." You must excel and surpass it in purity of principle and in higher degrees of holiness. Hence, if your eye offend, you must pluck it out; and if your arm offend, you must cut it off: you had infinitely better suffer an apparent disadvantage here than be entirely lost for ever, which will be the unavoidable consequence of the indulgence in any kind of evil.

Christianity provides for and requires in our daily life a more extended and impartial benevolence than we find in the common morality of the age. The highest points of worldly morality are honesty, harmlessness, and perhaps an occasional act of kindness to some near neighbour. The man who does no harm, who does not defraud people, who does not steal, but who pays his way in the world and injures no one, is generally thought good and innocent enough either for earth or heaven. However, Christianity condemns the man who merely does no harm to anybody, if

such a thing were possible. "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." There must not only be the absence of bad fruit, but the positive production of good fruit, in order to true Christian morality. And the whole language of the New Testament goes against the theory of the supposed innocence and harmlessness of worldly people. All are guilty who do not make the world better by their spirit and example and efforts. Men must be actively employed in doing good. The light of Christianity must not be hidden or concealed, but shine forth clearly and conspicuously. Sun and moon and stars are created to give light to all; the city on the hill is seen of all; the lighted candle is not put under a bushel but on a candlestick; and so you must not merely cease from harming your fellow-men but put forth loving effort to bless and benefit them. You must love them really and truly, not in name merely, not in feeling only, but in act and deed; not simply your personal friends, or your near neighbours, or those belonging to the same political party, or to the same religious denomination, or to the same nation, but man as man everywhere, and irrespective of creed or country or condition in life. It must not be a love of passing sentiment that weeps and does nothing for anybody; it must not be a love that is over prudent and always looking out for worthy objects of charity on which to expend its means and efforts, for sometimes the very unworthy must be allowed another chance in life; it must be a noble, pure, broad, healthy, disinterested and Godlike love, loving the evil and the good, the just and the unjust, and yet never losing its good sense in its methods of working.

Christianity provides for and requires in the daily life greater fortitude under trial than we find in the common-morality men of the age. The world teaches that we must live and get on in the best way we can; not perhaps exactly as we should most prefer, but as circumstances and the times will allow us. If a man's interests be in danger he must not be very nice on every point, nor over scrupulous about what he does to ward off the danger. If a man's character be taken away or his business be damaged, he is not tamely to stand that, not weakly to put up with that kind of thing. But Christianity says, "Love your enemies;" "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." You must submit to wrongs in a patient, loving, forbearing, forgiving, Christian spirit; but of course you must not encourage wanton outrage contrary to the law of the nation. As civil government is of Divine origin you must uphold and defend it. When Christ said, "I say unto you that ye resist not evil," He simply meant that you are not to seek the redress of your grievances in a cruel, vindictive spirit. It is nobler and more Godlike to forgive and to forbear than to retaliate when injured. "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you;" not Be fierce and malignant, but "rejoice and be glad," for so persecuted they the good and grand men of old, "the prophets which were before you." This is not the extreme and perverted altruism of Mr. Herbert Spencer; it is the reasonable altruism of Christianity.

Christianity provides for and requires in the daily life greater nobleness in conversation and temper than we find in the common morality of the world. It enjoins a charitable and merciful spirit. To resent an injury done

us, is in harmony with fallen human nature but not in harmony with Christianity. Men say it is manly to speak out when you are abused, and to tell people what you think of them. But that is the manliness of mere passion, and does not really show the man to be manly at all. He is not strong and noble who yields himself up to resentment, but of a weak spirit if he did but know it. Have you ever heard a good man greatly abused, and noticed that he only turned a little pale and bit his lip for a moment or two, but remained speechless? That is the strong Christian, the truly manly man. Such a man is master of himself. The other man is mastered by his passion. And Christianity requires that you completely conquer temper, tongue, and indeed your whole moral self; so that all may see from your spirit and procedure that you are genuine Christians, and be constrained to glorify God.

You see then the spirit and principle of Christian morality. As Christians you are to show that you are of God by maintaining good works. The lofty ideas and noble spirit of your Christianity should be infused into everything; should permeate your whole being; should influence your thinking, feeling, speaking and acting. In every station in life the Christian should be better than his neighbour. Christianity should make better masters and better servants; as masters giving what is proper for service, knowing that one is your Master even Christ; and as servants all things should be done in obedience to Christian law, done in all fidelity as if performed unto God. Christianity should make better husbands and better wives; should make them more faithful, forbearing, and affec-

tionate. Christianity should make make better sons and better daughters; should make them more dutiful, loving, and kind. Christianity should make better men of business; should make them more just before God and their fellows, so that their word will be their bond, and should lead them to do to others as they would others should do to them. Christianity should make men more humane, doing good to all men, especially to them who are of the household of faith. Christianity should make men more peaceable in disposition and spirit, as far as possible living peaceably with all men, and doing whatsoever will promote goodwill and brotherly affection among their fellows. Christianity should make men willing to endure provocation, insult, injuries, crosses, and even the loss of all things for Christ's sake and the Gospel's; living from day to day as seeing Him who is invisible, and maintaining a conscience void of offence toward God and men. Christianity should lead men to resolve that if they cannot get on and prosper without doing evil, then they will have the courage to fail, and they and theirs will starve rather than succeed by wrong-doing. Only let people act up to this high standard of morality, and the world will soon be a different world from the world it actually is to-day.

But let the morality of a community decline, and confusion and chaos will follow, and after bitter misery and suffering, national downfall will be the not very distant consequence. The decline and fall of Greece and of Rome are uniformly ascribed by philosophers and historians to misused riches, to the enfeebling influence of luxurious enjoyments. The most stable basis of any community is

Christian morality. "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Religion developing itself in the individual life and moulding the national character is a sure and lasting national foundation; and everything else is a foundation of sand. When the morality of a nation has declined, its national glory has gone down, as is seen and illustrated in the Hebrew nation, and in the French Revolution of 1793. The glory of moral purity is the glory that excelleth; a greater glory than successful arms, or commercial prosperity, or a flourishing literature, or mighty fleets, or extensive territory, or political liberty, or any other national consideration whatsoever. A nation may be head and shoulders above its compeers in all these particulars, and yet if destitute of moral purity it will sooner or later go down into the grave of nations, and be blotted from the map of nations. To be great and prosperous as a people is not everything; it is better to be noble and good. Political Economy as a science of society aims at making a community wealthy and prosperous, and in this way tries to secure material enjoyment for the people; but Christianity aims at making a nation virtuous, and by this method accomplishing the good of the people. Righteousness is before happiness. It is infinitely more important that we should be morally right than that we should be happy amid the greatest possible material good.

While dwelling on the subject of national morality, there is a subject we would rather not touch, but we feel we must,—we mean prostitution. We cannot talk about it, or write about it, so clearly or fully as its importance demands, and as its necessity demands in an age and nation like this. Our difficulty is that we cannot in any

terms fit for the public eye or ear bring the matter before the people; and this is a great sorrow to many a noble soul. All who have had to do with midnight meetings got up to assist fallen women, know what a hard thing it is to rescue these poor creatures. It is hard for the poor women themselves to reform, however anxious they may be to do so. Everybody shuns them, no one will have them in the house as servants, or in any other situation. Two ladies in a midland town were written to by a brother, begging those ladies most piteously to see if they could in any way do anything to get his sister to abandon her life of sin; "but," he added, "do not send her home to me, for I have had so much trouble with her already." They found the young woman, and asked her if she was willing to forsake her evil ways. She at once said she would be glad to do so; but asked, "Where can I go and what can I do?" The ladies could find no one who would trust the poor girl or give her employment; and all over the country for some reason or other these poor women have a strong objection to penitentiaries. And yet it is right they should go through some kind of probation; though perhaps a little unreasonable that they should be required to work exhaustively before they have had time to recover physical tone and strength. A lay missionary in Manchester received an earnest request from a Christian father to search for his daughter who had gone astray; he found her, and said, "My dear, however did you get into this evil way?" With a broken heart she replied, "Nay sir, it is not how did I get into it, but how can I get out of it?" We wish there were in all great towns some public institution open night and day, where these poor women

might go for a week or two without being too closely questioned about the past; the willingness of the girls to go there being taken as evidence of their wish to reform. Then in a week or two these poor girls should be transferred to a superior and more advanced institution, where they would be more closely watched and more efficiently taught. We imagine the main difficulty in dealing with them lies in the initiatory steps. And if when girls get into such an awful way of life, and find it to be infinitely more awful than they ever thought it, they had only some such institution as we have indicated to go to, less strict and inquisitive than the bulk of penitentiaries are, we fancy many more would be recovered to respectable society. How little the Christian public thinks and cares for poor fallen women, who are often more sinned against than sinning. They often get wrong when they leave their simple village home and go to seek situations in the great towns. Here they are exposed to temptations such as they never had before; and bad men are always on the outlook to entrap these poor simple souls and to make a gain of them. When once the girls have been fairly ensnared, it is with the utmost difficulty that they can escape. Every kind of network is thrown around them; they are worse than slaves in the worst days of slavery in the West Indies or in South America. And yet one of the most Christian nations in Europe has rendered criminal intercourse more safe, and so encouraged it by the Contagious Diseases Acts, thus driving immorality deeper into families and into the very heart of the community, and so endangering the stability of the commonwealth to serve the evil purposes of wicked men. It is difficult to be

calm when we think of such immoral laws remaining year after year on the statute book of England. Will you who are parents, and have sons and daughters of your own, help us in this painful work? It is positively dangerous to the purity and happiness of family life that such a state of things should exist in our country. If you neglect your duty in this particular, it may bring its own punishment sooner or later on you and yours. If your own comfortable households are not to be victimised by surrounding temptations, help us to improve the morals of the fallen who are almost completely helpless in their fall. As a matter of pure self-interest, to say nothing of Christian charity, you ought to consider this matter carefully and prayerfully, for it is eating its way into respectable Christian families, and breaking Christian hearts. But remember these poor fallen women are God's creatures, redeemed by the blood of Jesus, and possess immortal souls like yourselves. God loves and pities them, and the Saviour wants you to go to seek and save them in imitation of His own blessed example. How long will it be possible for circumstances of the following nature to occur in England and for the Christian churches to remain asleep and indifferent to the danger? "A memorial has been presented to Earl Granville by a committee of ladies and gentlemen for the purpose of exposing and suppressing the existing traffic in English, Scotch and Irish girls for infamous purposes abroad. The memorialists have been recently informed of numerous abductions from this country to Paris, Boulogne, and Hamburg." And this is not an occurrence of the distant past but of the present year of grace, 1880.

The darkness of this terrible depravity reaches to the letting of house property. And there are nearly whole streets in many great towns in which it is impossible for decent people to get a house for a fair price. First of all decent people are not wanted in such localities, as their conduct is a perpetual protest against the infamy around them. And secondly because landlords can let the houses for twice as much for infamy as they can in a fair honest way. What can we think of such owners of property? They are living upon the produce of immorality—just as many publicans and pawnbrokers are. We do not condemn wholesale all publicans, pawnbrokers, and landlords. No doubt there is a great difference between them, and there are degrees of guilt in the worst class of them. But a man has fallen to a low depth of evil who deliberately and knowingly pockets a higher percentage for cottages than he could get if he did not let them for infamy. Possibly some landlords leave everything to the house steward, or rent collector, and don't know the worst, or don't care to know it.

Do not turn away from this subject in disgust because it is disagreeable. The evil exists, and it will not improve matters if you dismiss it from your thoughts. Caution your own families, and let them know the dangers to which they are exposed. If parents cannot talk to their children, and take care of them, who can and ought? But you say you do not like them to know about such things. Probably they have read nasty things enough in the newspapers, and nastier things still in novels which you allow them to read freely. And so far as we have seen young women at midnight meetings, we have been impressed

with the numbers coming from respectable Christian homes. It has led to this reflection, "Do thoughtful, good people do justice to their own families by not plainly talking to their sons and daughters about the evils they must necessarily encounter in society as at present constituted? And another thing much needed in England to-day is, never admit a libertine into your house. If a poor woman unfortunately goes wrong, it is a social disgrace from which she never recovers; but a libertine is freely admitted to dinner parties where there are marriageable daughters. Is sin a disgrace in women, but no disgrace at all in men? Are women to suffer socially for moral improprieties, and men to be free from blame and punishment? And above all do honourable matrons in England lend themselves to these arrangements for the sake of securing wealthy husbands for their daughters? Who can wonder at our divorce courts after this? What is to become of our country if these things continue to be tolerated in our midst? We must calculate upon the just visitation of the God and Governor of human society, unless we as a people turn from our evil ways. Nationally as well as individually, "whatsoever we sow we shall reap." God may mercifully postpone the infliction of the penalty of violated law; but harvest time will be sure to come, and we shall gather in national results according to our national conduct. "*That*" shall we reap, and not something else. We appeal to all history for proof and illustration; and beg you to pray and labour in every possible way for social purity.

Mr. Berry says, "Late one evening James Hinton took me for a walk in the Strand. He led me into the Alhambra; we were very soon surrounded by women of

loose character. He took no notice of them, but held me by the coat with both hands and looked me in the face, and began quietly to talk about 'unconscious sacrifice.' Soon his gentle speech attracted the notice of the women, who grouped themselves round him, with the policemen who attended to keep order (the acting going on all the while on the stage), and all were spellbound while he sweetly discoursed on Christ's hatred of sin and pity for the sinner; and finished a most touching address of some ten minutes by saying, 'If our Saviour were on earth, where would He be? Why here!' And then we left, and my dear friend wiped tears from his eyes."*

The next fundamental principle of Christian sociology we refer to is *rational liberty*. As all are brothers we ought to respect the *conscience* of our fellow-men. Let your brother possess his own conscience. "Conscience, I say,—not thine own, but of the other." Every man has a right to liberty of conscience, a right to follow out his own conscientious views and convictions. There are two modes of enforcing rules of life on society—legal and moral—by parliamentary law and by public opinion. Now God's conduct furnishes us with a model of procedure. He does not coerce people into the doing of His will. Like God we should enlighten and exhort; teach and persuade. We see nothing but moral suasion that will do in this important business. We would not persecute and imprison the atheist. God against whom all evil is directly committed never employs force, or destroys man's moral agency; nor are we justified in attempting to do it. No man has a moral right to trample on the soul, will, and conscience of

* *Memoirs*. By Ellice Hopkins.

another. And yet men too commonly act as if they would like other people to do as they judge to be right and proper. We are not content with our own liberty of conscience; we want to control the consciences of others. Now the individual is sovereign over his own conscience and mind. No one has any power of a legitimate character to touch mind and conscience. Man in these respects is subject to God only. Some people pervert conscience, drag it into mere opinions. Conscience properly speaking has relation to moral duties.

It is not an absolute and independent judge of right and wrong in human conduct. Conscience is a relative faculty, and refers man to God and eternity, refers him to the decisions of a supreme Judge. Some people speak as if there were nothing above conscience,—but there is,—God and Holy Scripture. Conscience could not find out for itself a law of life to live by; but it recognises that law when it is given. It sees the truth and bears witness to the truth. Some people do not properly understand the province of conscience. Hence they speak of their conscience as if it were everything necessary. God is necessary and God's word is necessary also. When people say they do a thing conscientiously, it is needful to ascertain what kind of consciences they have. Some have an ignorant and uninstructed conscience. They do the most outrageous things morally considered. A weak conscience is often fruitful of the greatest moral mischief. And the conscience is mostly weak because people have not taken pains properly to inform and enlighten it. So far we must hold them to be guilty in the sight of God. And yet we must act tenderly toward weak and diseased consciences. Such is the teaching

of Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (chap. xiv.). But so far from respecting the conscience of other people we want them to be governed by our consciences. We are not content with our own liberty of conscience; we act as if we had conscience sufficient to guide a dozen people, and so strive to control and monopolise many consciences. Learn to let your neighbour possess and govern his own conscience, while you claim freedom of conscience for yourself. As God has only entrusted you with one conscience, it is as much as you can do properly to manage that. If the Lord had meant you to assume the control of the consciences of others, He no doubt would have given you a number of your own to superintend, as an economy of His labour. The story runs thus:—"A man once told a clergyman he could get no good under his preaching. The clergyman very naturally inquired how it was. The man replied that he could not conscientiously listen to him, because he wore very long bands. Then said the clergyman, 'Cut them as short as you think they ought to be.' He did so. 'Now,' said the clergyman, 'what am I to do with my conscience, for it will not let me wear them so short?'"

This is equalled if not surpassed by the following: A minister in Yorkshire occasionally played at bagatelle when his studies were over in the evening, and by that means he sometimes got rid of a bad headache, and slept all the better in consequence. A member of his congregation heard of the bagatelle, and took offence. One day the man called and stated his grievance to the minister. "I cannot," said the man, "come and hear you preach as long as you play at bagatelle." "Oh," said the

minister, "if that prevents your coming to worship God and getting good to your soul I will part with the bagatelle-board," and he gave it away to his nephews. By-and-by the man was taken ill and died. The minister regularly visited the man during his somewhat brief illness,—for they were the best of friends after all. To his utter amazement the minister heard after the interment that the man for years had been regularly committing adultery. Most people in the place knew this, but no one told the minister. Here is a man raising conscientious objections to a minister relieving an overwrought brain by playing at bagatelle, and the man all the while living in adultery.

But notwithstanding occasional sad lapses and surprising eccentricities, we ought to regard liberty of conscience as a God-given right; and as all around us have the souls and rights of brothers, *we ought also to be very tolerant of the views and opinions of other people.* They have an undoubted right to think for themselves, just as we have. Probably we shall never all think exactly alike on earth or in heaven. That would argue precise equality of mind, and equal opportunities for the development and education of mind. And as to thought and discussion we should be governed by the sentiment,—"We be brethren." Some men feel that they must think for themselves. They in fact cannot help it. It is the nature and need of their mind to think as they do. They must have other minds given them if they are to be made like other people who never think, or who at best are easy and superficial thinkers, readily taking everything for granted without looking into its nature, and with a most provokingly comfortable state of mind resting in hearsay evidence. And why should we be so anxious to

put down the opinions of other people? What we wish to crush out may be the true view of things. Think of Galileo, Socrates, Jesus. At any rate the opinions of people demand impartial investigation. Truth cannot be killed, and error cannot live if there be no basis of truth in it. We may reason and remonstrate where there is ascertained falsehood, but even then we cannot punish error. Men ought to have liberty of thought and liberty of speech; or freedom not only to think but to publish and discuss thought, limited only by moral right. No man can have rational liberty to do wrong, for that is not liberty but license. Human liberty must always be subject to Divine law. God is sovereign; He must govern and we must obey. Liberty everywhere and in everything is limited by the law of righteousness. The law of right is defined and expounded in the Bible. We have no controversy with those who deny the inspiration and authority of Scripture. The utmost liberty of thought and action ought to be allowed in things innocent and non-essential. The way John Stuart Mill reasons in his essay on *Liberty*, goes on the supposition that moral truth cannot be ascertained with certainty; and so from his standpoint he concludes that good and bad opinions ought to be freely canvassed. As there is no human infallible judge of truth, each one on his principle is to do what is right in his own eyes. We reply God is an Infallible Judge of truth, and He has taught us in the Bible what is to be our guide in all intercourse between man and man. Surely then with the Bible in our hands, we have some knowledge of the elements of morality in the nineteenth century of Christianity! If there are no certain *criteria* of moral truth,

then alas it is absolutely unattainable. The argument of Mr. Mill proves too much, and would go to show that there is no certainty because *we* are not infallible. We think there is such a thing as certainty because God is infallible. Mr. Mill's reasoning would put all certainty of every kind of truth, but mathematical truth, entirely out of our reach. Yet as men may err in the interpretation of truth, it becomes us to be exceedingly tolerant of all opinions which are not positively mischievous and immoral, or opinions subversive of all righteous conduct. Owing to the neglect of this guiding principle Roman Catholics have killed Protestants, and Protestants have killed Roman Catholics. Surely the time has arrived when conscientious convictions and opinions may be discussed without people burning one another at the stake. To canvass received opinions keeps them from becoming mere dead beliefs. It is often an advantage to truth itself to be discussed, as in that way we get clearer conceptions of it, understand it better, and are led to admire it more. "Truth is like a torch," says one; "the more 'tis shook it shines." Truth is one and immutable; it cannot be altered in its nature, but may be buried or lie forgotten and neglected for ages. Yet the proposition with us is inadmissible, that the truth of the Bible is left an open question. We are prepared to make great allowance for men on the ground of peculiarity of mental constitution, early training, and a variety of circumstances; but we cannot admit that moral truth is uncertain or unattainable. The children of men may be taught by the great Father in heaven, and understand Him to some extent too; just as the children of a great philosopher may be taught by their father, and take in what he

tells them, though incapable for the present of understanding all the profound problems of philosophy. As however while on earth we see through a glass darkly, and understand things of a Divine nature partially and imperfectly, being as we are in the childhood of intellect, and not attaining the manhood of soul and mind till we get into another state of being,—we should in this life let people think for themselves, without being too ready to put them down because we cannot see eye to eye with them. The grand words should be inscribed on the banners of all churches and societies, and not only adopted but acted upon in times of peace and of trouble,—"In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

The final fundamental principle we refer to is *education.* Is it not a sad fact that though we are our brother's keeper we have allowed him to remain in the greatest ignorance? In some instances ignorant of the common elements of education, so that the noble intellect God has given man has not been cultivated and developed as it might and ought. We are glad however that there is considerable national improvement in this respect, and that the children of the present generation have educational privileges their fathers never dreamt of. Indeed giant strides have been taken of late in the education of the country. The work to be done was great. The difficulties to be overcome were numerous and formidable. Still the Act of primary education has been passed in England, contemplating the education of each child in Britain. Formerly the education of the people was opposed on the ground that a little knowledge was thought to be a dangerous thing. It would be just as reasonable to con-

clude that a little light is a dangerous thing, or a little food is a dangerous thing, or a little clothing is a dangerous thing. The need of education for the labouring man has not long been felt to be of importance to the nation. Many completely disregarded the matter, while others declared it to be wrong that domestic servants and children intended to earn their bread by manual labour should be taught anything beyond reading and a little ciphering. Good, narrow-minded, simple Christian people formerly held these views in large numbers. Recently however men have learnt that want of education put the country to a disadvantage. The nation suffers in manners, morals, science, art, literature, and in its manufacturing interests; in fact in all that makes a nation great, influential and powerful when the education of the people is neglected. But now that we have got a national system of education the law should be put in force, so that no drunkard or idler or selfish parent could interfere with the intelligence and mental welfare of the community. It was estimated that within fifty years the proportion of scholars in schools prior to the Education Act was raised from one in seventeen to one in seven. And since then the increase has proceeded with greater rapidity. "In 1870 there were 1,693,000 children on the registers of schools in England and Wales; in 1879, the last completed school year, the number was 3,710,000. It thus appears that in the course of nine years the number of children on the registers has been much more than doubled, and that the absolute increase is upwards of two millions."

At the College of Preceptors, Farringdon Street, Mr. Mundella, at the distribution of the prizes in July, 1880,

is reported to have said "he had evidence afforded him day by day of the growth of elementary education in the country, and of the demand which now seemed to be penetrating into all classes of the community for a better education than had previously been given. The College of Preceptors, dating back for thirty years, had the honour of being the first educational guild in the country, and of providing the first examining body in the country. The institution from small beginnings had attained to great results. During the last five or ten years its growth had been exceedingly rapid. In 1867 only 150 schools were affiliated with it, and now the number was 1,200 or 1,300. During the last year nearly 8,000 pupils were examined in 100 local centres, representing at least 50,000 children of the middle classes of this country. The question of examination was fast becoming one of great importance to the middle-class schools of England. He was glad to find that the number of women who presented themselves for examination was on the increase, believing as he did that on the proper training of women the greatness of the future of this country mainly depended. He would refer to the strength and force of a great educational movement now going on in this country. It was often said, though he had not yet discovered any proof of it, that the elementary schools of the country were competing with the middle-class schools. His belief was that nothing ever did more to stimulate secondary education in England than the passing of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and for this reason: That Act taught the middle classes that if they intended their children to hold their own against the children in elementary schools, it was their duty to make

greater sacrifices for them, and to educate them in a proper manner. The public had been, as a whole, too remiss and indifferent on this question of education, but it was satisfactory to know that whilst 2,000,000 more children were now being educated in the country, a cry for higher education reached us from all parts of the land. Education inverted the ordinary rule. The supply created the demand, and he trusted that the result would show that elementary education, secondary education, and university education would act and react beneficially one on the other. It was, he thought, a subject for well-grounded complaint that parents withdrew their children too soon from instruction, and he pointed out that the exigencies of trade and commerce did not really require a lad to take his seat in the counting house at fourteen or fifteen years of age. Last year Mr. Forster, speaking in that place, advocated the placing of secondary schools under State supervision, and although the Bishop of Exeter shared that view, he (Mr. Mundella) was not prepared to go to that length. He wanted to see perfect freedom of teaching, but was willing to see the system of State inspection applied to the endowed schools of the country."

Middle-class education is now one of the most important topics that can engage public attention ; and if the middle class hold their own, they must seek higher education for their children. The offspring of the artisans have been getting a better education in our day schools under Government inspection, than the children of the middle class have in the bulk of boarding-schools throughout the country. But we trust the time has come when no person who has failed in everything else will be deemed fit to set

up a boarding-school, and to teach with only the one qualification of being able to persuade parents to send their children to him. We trust also that special subjects will be taught in all our Government schools, or schools under Government inspection; such as the laws of health, the elements of science, natural and political, and languages where there are children of special capacity. Mr. Mundella, in moving the education estimates in the House of Commons, 1880, said: "Some inspectors were for discouraging the teaching of science and for encouraging the teaching of language. Some will be in favour of substituting a play of Shakespeare for some simple lessons in science which we have given in our schools. I hold that it is most important that children, while at school, should be taught something of the laws of health, and of the functions of the body." In those schools where the special subjects are taken the highest efficiency is attained in the lower departments. Mr. Rathbone says: "I find that after we first introduced special subjects into our school, the average percentage of passes in the 'three R's' began to improve, and it continued steadily to do so." A smattering of science is better than total ignorance.

No one can foresee what splendid service the poor boys in our schools may render to our country in the future. The money spent in this way may repay the nation a thousandfold. It is in our judgment a national humiliation that only 40,000 out of two and a half millions in regular attendance are instructed in special subjects. We may neglect our buildings, we may neglect our streets, we may neglect our drainage to a great extent, and yet be great and prosperous as a people; but the neglect of

national education means national ruin. Let us exercise a wise and thoughtful concern for the future of our country.

"Our School Boards are modestly housed as compared, for example, with our town and city councils, but the work the former are doing immensely transcends in intrinsic importance the work of the latter. We could manage to rub along for the next fifty years with narrow streets, with bad pavements and bad sewerage, with every disadvantage in short except a destitution of light and water. But popular ignorance and household suffrage would mean by the end of that time political ruin. Household suffrage we must have. Government in England cannot be carried on without it. All that remains, then, is to supply the popular instruction which will render it, not only not baneful, but advantageous to the State. We could dispense with our army better than we could dispense with our schools."

But we have not only in the past undervalued education for the masses in science, music, languages and general literature; in grammar, geography, and history; but we have undervalued also technical education and almost entirely neglected it as it respects our artisans. So that we have greatly neglected our brother the working man, not merely with reference to intellectual culture, and so left him in his ignorance to the lowest sensual pleasures; we have also neglected him as it respects fitting education for his work itself. Competent judges say that the foreign artisan has hitherto had better opportunities of becoming a skilled, scientific, and artistic workman than the English artisan. This guilty neglect is likely to bring punishment to the country at large, as there is danger of

foreigners being able to produce better work than we can, and so attracting a valuable portion of our trade to their shores. We can only turn aside this danger by putting technical education within the reach of the working population of our country. The first year in which aid was given to popular science classes was 1860, when the number of classes assisted was only nine. The classes grew, by 1872, to nearly one thousand, representing above thirty-eight thousand pupils. At present, 1880, drawing is taught in 4,489 elementary schools, to a total number of 725,129 children. The total number of students in art classes is 29,393. The total number of students in science classes is 59,519. We are aware that Mechanics' Institutes, Reading-rooms, and Free Libraries have supplemented the day schools through the country, and very materially assisted poor men in their praiseworthy efforts to enlarge their knowledge. But there is yet great room for improvement, and a wealthy nation like ours should do a great deal more than it does for the intellectual advancement of the multitude. It is thought by some of the leading statesmen of the day that the Elementary Education Act will help rather than destroy Mechanics' Institutes—that young men will be better fitted to profit by these Institutes. But we regret that the average attendance in night schools has fallen from 74,000 in 1870 to 52,500 in 1879.

This does not afford the encouragement to earnest educationists which we anticipated. But as young people do not require to go to night schools now to learn the three R's, the above number may include many who are building in after life on day-school instruction.

We do not mean to intimate by the foregoing state-

ments that knowledge will ever be the saviour of the country, or that the kingdom of God will ever be built up in the human intellect. We may bring about a worship of mind or a scientific materialism, but general intelligence will never regenerate the nation. And yet the culture of the mind is valuable, not of the highest possible value, but still exceedingly valuable. God would never have given mind if He did not intend its faculties to be educated. We must always keep in view the intellectual progress of the race for the accomplishment of God's purposes in the good of society. Men are not continually to be receiving into themselves thoughts and principles, as if the end of knowledge were their own mental elevation and pleasure. They must give out as well as take in ideas and principles; communicate knowledge for the glory of God and the benefit of their fellows. The faculties of the mind must therefore be sharpened to fit man for his work, position, and destiny. We do not see why economic science might not be taught to children in our day schools as well as music and drawing. The working men of the country must understand the elements of political economy, if they are to exercise the franchise intelligently, and make the most of their material resources. At the same time the churches must do a great deal more for the education of the soul and conscience. We think the public generally have expected too much from mere education. It has been too commonly taken for granted that crime and ignorance are always inseparably associated, as if ignorance alone produced crime. Do not dirt and crime as really go together as ignorance and crime? We greatly wonder

how many criminals come from filthy homes and are filthy in person. Perhaps this will be regarded as an argument for sanitary education, and really it is; but education has not been looked at in this light hitherto. It is time we did so regard it.

Justice Lush has several times stated it to be his opinion that while in recent times education has increased crime has increased also. This may easily be the case if the education of the conscience be neglected while the intellect is sharpened. The education of the moral faculties must go on with the education of the mental faculties, or man will become clever without becoming good, the intellectual power will become greater than the moral control. We must not expect to get out of a thing what is not in it. "Whatsoever a man soweth *that* shall he also reap," and not something else of an essentially different nature. If you want to get natural results you must use natural means. If you want to get moral results you must use moral means. Sowing education you get learning or intellectual improvement. And it is only by sowing Christian principles that you make Christians. Yet as in our literature generally there are so many moral ideas and spiritual truths, may we not from these reasonably expect some improvement in society while we cannot hope for moral results from purely mental means?

These things then we hold to be vital to the community, essential to the stability and prosperity of society; universal truthfulness, universal justice, universal benevolence, universal purity, universal rational liberty, universal education. There must be the freest and fullest development

of the individual life, in order to the freest and fullest development of the national life.

And we hold further that these are the great laws to be acted on in all international policy. Between nations as well as between individuals within the nation there must be worked out and illustrated these cardinal principles and virtues. We must leave nations freely and fully to develop their nationality. Toward nations we must be truthful, just, benevolent, pure, and allow them the liberty we claim for ourselves, as well as enlighten and educate them in all that is for their material and moral good. Not selfishly keep to ourselves all the benefit of our skill and intelligence, but aid in every possible way the progress of the race as something infinitely more precious than the material prosperity of our own particular country. Many seek and wish protection for particular interests; want in fact to keep to themselves all the good arising from national progress. No, says the Great Father of us all, "Freely ye have received; freely give." "The light is not to be put under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all in the house," which is the whole world. The whole family of man must be allowed to participate in the fruits of Christian civilisation, and be treated as the offspring of a Divine Father; living under the same government, subject to the same laws, to share in the same blessings of providence and grace; in fact our equals and brothers for time and eternity.

CHAPTER IV.

SOCIAL LESSONS.

THE social teachings of human brotherhood are important and manifold. This is a subject which in the most emphatic manner possible condemns bribery, drunkenness, pauperism, crime, some aspects of the land-laws, the separation of the classes, the unforgiving spirit among men, the ignorance in which we leave men as to their interests generally, strikes and lock-outs, national selfishness, war, slavery, and all the abominations of the opium trade. It condemns all social wrong and injustice by whatever name it is baptised. It teaches that we should respect one another, love one another, assist one another in all that is for our good, and that we should be brothers in deed as well as in name. A true and practical brotherhood is what is needed. Not the mere profession, not a sham and pretence, not loud talk and promising appearances, but a vital, real and abiding society of true human brothers.

The brotherhood of men teaches that *bribery is a black and bitter crime against God and man.* It is impossible to speak too severely against it. And the man who bribes is infinitely worse than the man who is bribed, though both are undoubtedly bad enough. The rich man corrupts the poor man, taking advantage of the poor man's necessities, tempting him in his weak point, lowering his moral ideas, and thus degrading him, with the perception that it may

probably lead to the ruin of the man; for the doing of wrong is like the letting out of water—where and when it will stop nobody can tell. But on the other hand the poor man often willingly yields to his selfish and corrupt feelings, and without any consideration of right or honour sells himself to the highest bidder. Moral manhood is enfeebled, the commonwealth suffers, good men are made sad, and the Redeemer of men and Saviour of society mourns. It is indeed a melancholy fact that so many intelligent people in many of the counties and boroughs of England organise and carry out a system of bribery at both the municipal and parliamentary elections. They have frequently done it openly and unblushingly, when bribery has been shamelessly resorted to on both sides, and the man with the longest purse has been sure to carry the day. In other cases men have secretly gone to work, and afterwards boasted of the clever way in which they did their dirty deeds, contriving to escape detection and to baffle all the efforts of justice;—"whose glory is in their shame." Perhaps the most humiliating feature in modern bribery is the infinite ease with which Christian men slide into the practice, and then with an untroubled conscience conclude that they are guilty of no particular crime. Do we need higher proof of the power of evil to deaden the moral sensibilities? Yet are not bribers far more numerous amongst us than we commonly suppose? How many good sort of people bribe railway porters. Innocently enough they imagine they may place a few coppers in the hand of the man who carries their luggage, opens the carriage-door, and patiently stands beside it waiting till the train leaves and they get comfortably off. Now this is to lower the tone of mind

both in the receiver and giver; it develops the deep-rooted selfishness of both parties. The porter soon learns to attend to the persons who as he thinks are likely to give him a trifle; and the traveller with means monopolises the services of the porter for his own convenience. But alas for the poor and helpless who have nothing to give! The aged widow unaccustomed to travelling, the poor mother with several young children and much luggage under her care, and young people scarcely in their teens—all these are coolly neglected and have to help themselves as best they can, while the man who can pay for attention bribes the porter to break the rules of the railway company. And probably these are not the most mischievous results. The station master probably fails to get the train off in time, because the bribed porters fail to do full duty; and the consequences of delay are serious enough from year to year. The inconvenience to commerce is not the worst thing; life and property are endangered. But bad as this is when looked at in a right light, the most awful aspects of bribery are seen in connection with the Church of Christ. It is bad enough as seen in political matters, but worse when introduced into religion. And yet there are people who bribe the poor with blankets, and money, and the offer of situations for their sons and daughters if they will only allow their children to leave the conventicle and attend some episcopally-consecrated place of worship. Such attempts at Christianising the people weaken and corrupt their character; it is not making but buying Christians, and is almost enough to bring Job out of his grave to confront them with the terrible words he recorded against this crying evil: "For the congregation of the hypocrites shall

be desolate, and the fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery." Surely as men have souls and are our brothers we ought not to corrupt them with bribes, either to pervert justice or to secure their votes or to get their custom, and least of all to get them to church or chapel. Would that men in general were manly enough to act the part of an engine-driver who, when offered a half-crown by a gentleman at a railway station in Yorkshire, on account of splendidly bringing up the train to the minute, simply said, "Sir, I get wages for my work, and I am satisfied with them." We suppose the honest Yorkshireman felt he had no moral right to hire himself to the railway company, and then afterwards to the passengers he was driving on the line. Oh that such instances of honesty, courage, and unselfishness were less rare amongst us. Especially we could wish that writers for the press were less frequently open to receive bribes for articles and leaders. Gentlemen have sometimes boasted that they could get a leader inserted in any newspaper for a consideration. We are disposed to place a good deal to the account of such men's vanity; at the same time we fear there is some degree of truth in these statements. Men too commonly write to order, not according to their own convictions and principles as the unsuspecting public suppose, but as barristers plead– that is, according to the payment made; and too easily a golden key will open the most difficult lock. We do not mean to charge wholesale bribery upon everybody, but we do hold it to be more extensive and manifold in its methods of operation than most people imagine. And we especially hold it to be a foul blot upon the guardians of public opinion and virtue, when for private gifts they turn aside

from the path of honour and integrity. Statesmen in these days cannot sell peerages and baronetcies for money as they used to do, but they sell them for votes and mere party service. Not because a man has served his country more than another, but because he wrote and spoke and fought hard for the party in power. With no other claim to the distinction he marches up to the pinnacle of dignity, while other men of greater and more disinterested service, and at the same time men of finer qualities, are left out in the cold. It is evident that promotion too commonly goes by favour and not by merit. Besides men are fearfully bribed by luxury, ease, and wealth, tempted and turned aside from the path of rectitude by some small advantage, or trifling indulgence, or prospective enjoyment. Place and pomp and power lead men to tread upon rivals, to trample upon innocence, to stick at no injustice or meanness in order to work their way up in life. Not only will a poor sweep or scavenger sell himself for a glass of beer to act the fool during a municipal or parliamentary election, but greater men carry out the same principle in other ways and forms. To get into what is called "good society," to secure an invitation to some grand party, and especially to be put in the way of promotion to honour, office and wealth, men will not only sell their own souls, but the souls of their wives and sons and daughters too. Judas was respectable compared with some who would take a bribe, not merely from the priests, but from the devil himself to secure their object!

Business men say it is difficult to get orders unless they "tip" the foreman or manager; and the grocer finds it hard to keep his respectable customers unless he "tips"

the cook or the housekeeper. This is bribery in gentlemen's houses and in business establishments; but the fault is with the briber. Business men might put an end to it, if they did not try to push one another out of the way. Just now the Commissioners are sitting on the election petitions (Oct., 1880); and the corrupt disclosures made are so black that it makes us less proud of being Englishmen.

Looking at *the brotherhood of men in relation to drunkenness* we cannot but ask, Why should there be a public-house for the sale of intoxicating drink every fifty or sixty yards? This is tempting men in their weakest point, and often it is impossible for poor men going home with their wages in their pockets to get past six or seven public-houses in a town or village, though they may manage successfully to resist the temptation of the first two or three. It is a vital point to reduce the number of these public-houses. It is in every way for the public good carefully to weed out the lowest and worst of them. Sunday closing ought to be contended for by all well-wishers of the public good. Why should such houses be open seven days a week when drapers, grocers, and bakers are only allowed to do business six days a week? The most dangerous and injurious business has a monopoly on Sunday refused to other trades, and during ordinary days it is allowed to make longer hours. All this is clearly wrong, and must be changed.

On the subject of the Sunday closing of public-houses, the report to the Wesleyan Conference of the Committee for Promoting the Religious Observance of the Lord's Day contains some important facts:—"In the year 1839 a

Select Committee of the House of Commons reported: 'It is sufficiently notorious that drunkenness is the main cause of crime, disorder, and distress in England.' The Lords' Committee on Intemperance, in their recent valuable report, have emphatically repeated the same judgment, and observation and experience continually go to confirm and strengthen the conviction thus expressed. Mischievous and demoralising, however, as is the influence of the public-house system in general, a bad pre-eminence attaches to Sunday drinking in public-houses. Nearly 120,000 public-houses of various kinds are opened on every Sabbath in this country. More than a quarter of a million of persons must be engaged in the work of these houses. It is computed that nearly £400,000 is spent on liquors on each Lord's Day, the far larger part of which enormous sum comes out of the pockets of the labouring classes. The result is seen in the fact that on Monday the cases of drunkenness and disorder before our magistrates are greatly multiplied. Thousands of families are ill-fed and ill-clothed all through the week because the wages of the bread-winners are swallowed up in the debauch of the Sunday. In many cases Monday is lost to the working classes, and thus one-sixth of the lawful days of toil is thrown away.

"Efforts have been made from time to time to restrict the hours on the Sabbath during which this evil traffic may be carried on. Nine-tenths of Ireland are now placed under the *régime* of Sunday closing; and the whole of Scotland for thirty years has been under this rule, and in each case with incalculable social and economic benefits. Public opinion in England, irrespective of political party,

has been steadily, if not rapidly, growing in this direction, especially in our large towns and cities. We may refer to the remarkable fact that in Liverpool the Town Council have with only one dissentient resolved to memorialise Parliament for the entire cessation of the liquor traffic on Sunday, and that a canvass of householders in more than three hundred towns and villages in various parts of the land, representing a population of three millions, gives 464,912 in favour of entire closing on Sundays, 57,180 against, and 35,331 neutral. Among the more respectable class of the publicans and licensed victuallers themselves the desire is extending for full liberty to those engaged in this trade to have a day of rest for themselves and their families, such as is enjoyed by every other trade in the country. In March of this year, 1880, a letter was addressed to every member of the House of Commons, signed by the President of the Conference and the secretaries of your committee, respectfully urging, in the interests of sobriety, social order, and national religion, the support of the resolution which Mr. J. P. Stevenson had given notice to move on the 12th of that month, 'That it is expedient that the law which limits the hours for the sale of liquor in England and Wales on the Sunday should be extended to the whole of that day." Just at that time intimation was given of an early dissolution of Parliament and a general election, and the resolution was withdrawn. In the new House of Commons the same resolution substantially was reintroduced, and in conjunction with the secretaries of the Temperance Committee a circular was issued to all the ministers, and the entire Connexion was called upon to co-operate with other Chris-

tian communities and public bodies in a general petition movement, and as usual the response of our people was promptly and generally given; and it is with unfeigned satisfaction we record, as illustrative of the great advance of opinion both in and out of Parliament, that the resolution of Mr. Stevenson was carried on Friday, June 25th, by a majority of 153 against 117."

But little advantage will be gained by closing public-houses, if working men's clubs are permitted to sell any quantity of drink to the members during the whole of Sunday. We understand that in many of these clubs the income from the sale of drink is greater on the Sabbath than it is during the whole of the week. Gentlemen's clubs must be looked into if working men's clubs be touched. You cannot by the common law of England make "fish of one and flesh of another." There ought only to be refreshments for *bonâ fide* travellers. Billiard rooms, music saloons, and benefit societies or sick clubs should be entirely separated from public-houses for the sale of intoxicating drink; and election committees in such houses should be rendered illegal. These measures would greatly help to reduce drunkenness. Habitual drunkards should be kept in confinement: if they cannot take care of themselves society must take care of them, and protect itself while it protects them. It is a wise policy to "empty by filling," and so we should be careful to get substitutes for public-houses; that is, public reading rooms, coffee taverns, working men's clubs without drink, or any kind of rational inducement that will keep working men out of the public-houses. Try to get them away from drink and to keep them away from it, by finding them occu-

pation that will fill the mind. Let teetotallers accept all the help they can get from non-teetotallers, and put the good cause on a safe rational Christian basis; that is, the law of liberty abridged by the law of charity. It is foolish in the extreme to waste time and strength in the effort to unchristianise good men who do not totally abstain, or to talk about "the demon drink," as if evil existed in matter and not in the moral agent. Patriots, philanthropists, and Christians ought to be united to effect the social reformation of the people in relation to the gigantic evil of drunkenness, which stops the progress of almost every organised attempt to elevate the people. We do not expect that Acts of Parliament will ever make England sober; but intelligent conviction and Christian enlightenment will do so. Yet Parliament has a right to stop temptation to evils when such evils are demoralising the people and ruining the commonwealth. As Mr. Gladstone puts it—the Legislature ought to "make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong." And all men anxious for the good of their country should be prepared to take legislation by instalments, if they cannot get all they desire at once.

Public-houses are greatly in the hands of brewers, and some are let on the barrel-rent system; that is, the publican has the house rent free on the condition that he sells so many barrels of beer per week. This is an arrangement to push the trade, and so as much as possible to demoralise the people. And agents are put into public-houses belonging to brewers, so that if the law comes down upon them the agents are fined, and other agents put in, and thus the real offenders can go on in their own sweet

way and laugh at the law. The only inconvenience the brewer has is to change the agent and pay the small fine.

The Government gets a splendid revenue from the drink traffic, and this is one obstacle in the way of dealing with it by legislation. But how does the Government obtain that splendid revenue? From the murdered bodies and ruined souls of thousands of our own brothers and sisters. Ministers of State say that they cannot do without the revenue from the drink system; and so they go on multiplying the temptations to drunkenness,—for this is practically what free trade in drink means,—it is free trade to tempt people to sin against body and soul.

The secretary of the Manchester and Salford Wesleyan Lay Home Mission Society, asked the missionaries what they considered the greatest hindrance to their work. Every man of them immediately said straight out, "Drink sir, drink sir, drink sir." Children cry for bread and cannot get it because the father has taken his wages to the public-house; women pawn their own things, their husband's things, their children's things, the things they can borrow from their neighbours, and the very things sent to them to wash,—for drink. It is the universal experience of all who work among the masses, and especially of those who work in the slums and alleys of our great towns, that drunkenness more than anything else impedes moral and material progress. And the judges of our country testify that most of the crime comes from the same cause. Medical science is coming more and more to the aid of temperance, by showing that disease is caused rather than cured by alcoholic drinks. Pauperism is largely produced by indulgence in drunkenness. In one of the largest

workhouses in Manchester it was stated by the governor that eighty per cent. of the inmates came there through drunkenness. Probably the same might be said of similar places in all similar populations.

Probably the adulteration of intoxicating drink is not carried on to the same extent as formerly, but very likely it still pays to drug the drink, notwithstanding the risk of being fined. Men can soon gain the amount they are fined by adulterating beer or wine and spirits. For one publican brought before the magistrate and fined how many escape altogether?

How is the terrible drunkenness of our country to be put down? Surely it is reasonable that greater local authority should be given by Parliament to deal with this, as well as to deal with other local matters. It does not, perhaps, appear that public opinion is yet ripe in this country for the Maine Law or the Permissive Bill. The question of Local Option may come nearer to the idea of many, as to what is right and proper to be done; but even this is much of the same nature as the Permissive Bill. It is rather another mode of doing the same thing. But while greater local authority should in some way be given to deal with this and many other questions, it does seem that the work of suppressing drunkenness will have to be done mainly by spreading intelligence and by personal Christian activity. When we look at the great amount of drunkenness around us, it almost appears as if nothing had been accomplished either by teetotalism or by the churches; but when we look at the matter in the light of history, it appears in an entirely different aspect. Formerly it was not the same social disgrace to get drunk that it now is, and the exception was

not for persons to be drunk as is now the case, but for them to be sober. We are a sober people to-day compared with the people of past centuries. This is encouragement for all social reformers and Christian workers. We must go on enlightening and convincing the public, and not quarrel among ourselves or with good men who cannot feel it their duty fully to abstain from intoxicating drink. Nor must we waste energy and time and means by discussing sacramental wine, and so dividing churches; we have more serious and earnest business to attend to, and we need all the force we can command to carry practical measures waiting our consideration. At present it is impossible entirely to sweep away houses for the sale of intoxicating drink, whatever good we may think would thereby be effected for England. Wise men will therefore direct their efforts to measures of suppression and restriction, and above all they will be united in their action. Perhaps the main point to be regarded just now is the licensing authority. The people must have a voice in the matter, some power to protect themselves against the terrible evils of the drinking system as at present existing. Things cannot be permitted to go on as they are. There must be some sort of popular interference and control. It must in some way rest largely with the people themselves, however strongly some good and intelligent men may oppose permissive legislation. It is very questionable whether the masses are prepared to deal with the subject, were the votes of the majority to decide as to the opening or closing of a public-house in any given district. Take the worst districts of our towns and cities, and some are so ignorant, and others so fond of drink, that the probability is that

any permissive prohibition would be defeated. Let education go on, the dwellings of the poor be attended to, and then the drink traffic may by-and-by be safely left in the hands of the people. In the meantime let strong effort be made to reduce the number of public-houses, and to take from the magistrates all power to go beyond a limited number in granting a license. Let them have no power to renew a license where drunkenness and disorder have been allowed. Such houses are generally the resort of prostitutes and thieves. Yet the renewal of the licenses of such infamous houses has mostly been a mere matter of course. Drunkards themselves have not been dealt with, unless "drunk and disorderly" or "drunk and incapable." In this way the interest of the liquor trade is encouraged at the expense of public morality. Let the laws be administered not in a spirit of indulgence and encouragement to the trade, but with a view to restriction and repression. Let the presence of drunken men and abandoned women be taken as proof of allowing drunkards and prostitutes in the house or on the premises. For the sake of society, the laws of a country should make it hard to do wrong and easy to do right.

Human brotherhood in its *relation to pauperism teaches that we should encourage thrift and discourage improvidence.* It is our duty by speech and act to impress upon the people the necessity of taking care of themselves. Habits of economy would, humanly speaking, make this a happy world. What is now absolutely wasted would supply the needs of the whole population of our country. Working men should be taught to look, not to government, not to legislation, not to political parties, but to themselves if

pauperism is ever to be lessened in the country. Wages are high in many trades, and yet many men getting their two or three pounds a week, with sons in some instances who greatly augment this sum, never lay by a penny for seasons of affliction or commercial panic. Indeed some of them have not a farthing by the middle of the week, and go to the parish for relief if sick or out of work for a fortnight. Steady careful men get on in the world, but these are not our difficulty. It is the dissolute, drunken, idle, extravagant, and thoughtless who plague and puzzle us. The question is, How shall these be improved or be necessitated to adopt a different course of procedure? Working men may by freeing themselves from the bondage of bad habits, by sobriety, intelligence, thrift, and self-education do more for themselves than if Parliament sat all the year round to legislate for them and for them only. One way of reducing pauperism is to teach people their true interests; and we have great faith in the more intelligent mixing freely with the less educated and talking to them for their good. There is too great a separation of the classes of society. We are afraid the separation is becoming greater year by year. But if the peer and the peasant can meet for political purposes, and also on the racecourse, they may surely meet for the social improvement and elevation of the poor. Great employers of labour have a good opportunity of giving instruction and advice to their men. If gone about in the right way the thing may be done effectually. But we fear these gentlemen too commonly never speak to the men they employ, unless perhaps when they take them on or turn them off. The master drives in from his suburban villa,

and as soon as his business is transacted quits the office, enters his carriage and drives home without coming into direct contact with his workpeople from one year's end to another; though the good he might do by getting among them a little, and occasionally holding a meeting for their improvement, is incalculable. Another method of reducing pauperism is attention to sanitary improvement, a point we have touched on elsewhere, and which involves the interests and health of the poor and rich alike. Probably the administrators of our poor-laws cannot do better than help those who are willing to help themselves more liberally than they help those who never attempt to make any provision for themselves in sickness or old age. Let this principle of procedure be distinctly understood by the people. The present poor-laws give most to the idle and improvident, and least to the economical and industrious who may be overtaken by affliction or misfortune. This is virtually a premium on self-neglect. We would completely reverse this process. Evidently something is fearfully wrong in our poor-law system: it has completely eaten away the independence of multitudes of the poor. It is an undoubted fact that paupers have largely produced paupers generation after generation. It is very true that the poor we shall always have with us, and we must think and care for the weak and helpless. It is no use attempting to conceal from ourselves the fact that in winter months and bad times multitudes of deserving poor must have relief. It is far better to help them by finding them employment, if that can be done even by sending them out of a county where labourers are in excess into a county where labour is abundant, notwithstanding the law of

settlement. Able-bodied paupers and beggars without a trade should be taught one. In this way they might be fitted for the colonies, and benefit themselves while they benefited the community. It would be a grand thing for the country if the intelligent and philanthropic would heartily work the Society for the Organising of Charity and Repression of Mendicity side by side with our poor-laws. If throughout England the two organisations were worked together, then many difficult cases might be fairly met. But if we stop mendicity without in some way helping the mendicants, we shall drive them to desperation. Many of them have grown up beggars, and have no other means of getting a living. Evidently they must be assisted to some honest and honourable means of obtaining a livelihood. And as to paupers in the workhouse able to work, having a trade, and so capable of earning their own living, we think that such persons should be put to profitable employment. Why give them the unproductive work of picking oakum or breaking stones when their labour might do so much more to lessen the poor-rates, and render the workhouse more extensively self-supporting? Pauper labour need not interfere with free labour, if there be no underselling. We feel strongly in favour of placing the children of paupers in the family of some sensible artisan to learn a trade, and to grow up under some more self-respecting and independent influence than the workhouse. But we would have these children under the constant inspection of gentlemen. We have not much hope for the reduction of pauperism and the elevation of the poor, unless Christian and philanthropic gentlemen give their sympathy and help to the subject.

At the Leicester Church Congress, 1880, the operation of the poor-law was specially referred to. "Mr. A. Pell, M.P., read a paper on 'The Church and the Poor—Pauperism, its Treatment, Curative and Preventive.' He remarked that there was abundant evidence that the application of the indoor test had resulted in the decrease of pauperism among the lower orders. They would all agree that the Church had not made a point of directing attention to the question of outdoor relief. The fact that nearly 900,000 persons who, if their cases were genuine, were unable on the 1st of January to find sufficient means of livelihood were living in England and Wales was a national disgrace. It was a question which the Church ought to take up, and did she not fall short of what was required of her by passing the matter by? The Church depended for its continuance as much upon the proper performance of its duties as upon dogma and ritual. It would be well if we could say we had tolerated neither slavery nor pauperism. The Bishop of Tasmania followed with a paper on 'The Encouragement of Thrift, Allotments, and Compulsory Insurance.' Earl Nelson said he did not think a system of compulsory insurance would bring about the desired results. The Bishop of Winchester thought it would be very desirable that some committee of thorough business men should sit upon the question, sift it well, and see if some of the difficulties against compulsory insurance could not be cleared away."

This subject was introduced into the House of Lords by the Earl of Carnarvon; and the Lord Chancellor (Selborne) "contended that the attempt to enforce compulsory contributions for insurance might force up wages,

as it was highly probable that the labourers from whose earnings the money was deducted would insist on having the difference made up, and the consequence would be that the insurance would be a tax on the employers." The public prints mostly took the same view. "The plan would not encourage thrift, but rather the reverse, for it may reasonably be suspected that the majority of men after they had paid the insurances of ten pounds would cease to trouble about saving any more, and might, in fact, become intentionally thriftless. The Earl of Carnarvon's distinguished friend informs him that this payment of ten pounds at twenty-one would ensure eight shillings a week at what is vaguely called old age; but those acquainted with the principles of insurance will be slow to accept this dictum. The acceptance of all lives indiscriminately and without regard to considerations of health at one fixed sum would be contrary to every principle on which existing insurance companies regulate their business, and the probability is that to a very large extent the scheme would simply result in throwing the burden of the sick poor upon those who were as poor as themselves, but still in better health, and in making the good lives pay heavily for the bad—an injustice which would never be tolerated."

It is difficult, too, to encourage thrift by Government taking the savings banks, and giving a higher percentage than ordinary banks pay for deposits, without forcing private firms or limited liability companies unfairly to compete with the Government. But might not philanthropists and charitable organisations do this within given limits? The difficulty is in the first efforts to economise and save. When the poor have saved forty or fifty pounds

the habits of thrift have begun to thrive. Supposing therefore that for the first fifty pounds a higher percentage were allowed, and after attaining that point the money were to be transferred to an ordinary savings bank, or the deposit to lie at the ordinary rate of interest, would it not be worth while to put thriftless people on their feet in this way for the sake of society generally? We imagine to give money this way is infinitely better than mere indiscriminate almsgiving, which only pauperises the people. Perhaps churches should look at the question, especially in its application to the lowest portions of the population in our great towns. But we must be careful to let people walk as soon as we have got them upon their feet, or we shall inflict a serious injury upon them. The poor-laws of England are essentially socialistic in theory and principle; but fairly looked at the socialism is Christian. Arrangements ought to exist in Christian society whereby all shall be sure of bread in misfortune and infirmity. The difficulty is to do this without encouraging improper reliance on a public system of charity or violating Christian justice toward our brother in calamity. We believe that the poor-laws of England have been a tremendous curse to our country on the one hand, while a great blessing on the other. Men have said, "We'll have a spree; we'll be jolly and merry while we can; and if the worst comes there is the workhouse to go to." And so they have spent what ought to have been laid by for a time of need; then they and theirs have been thrown upon the parish. Unless the poor-laws are carefully and prudently administered, the least deserving get most, and the most deserving get least; and our poor-law system

becomes a gigantic organisation to encourage drunkenness, extravagance, and every sinful indulgence.

The question of the relation of brotherhood *to crime is a very difficult and yet an important one.* We ought to put forth our best efforts to suppress immoral publications, to break up all establishments intended to corrupt our youth, and set our faces like flint against all public vice, which is the fruitful parent of so much crime and misery in society. We are compelled to imprison our criminals as an act of justice, self-protection, and as a deterrent to crime. But we ought to make prisons to a very large extent self-supporting, to adopt profitable labour instead of mere penal labour. It is a great pity that something more is not done to prevent the fearful evils of promiscuous association during the term of imprisonment, as this greatly hinders reformation, especially on the part of the less depraved prisoners. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." Thousands come out of prison ninety times worse than they were when they entered. Perhaps much might be done for discharged prisoners by relief and by finding them employment immediately upon their leaving prison, and keeping them from their old haunts and companions. But in and out of prison it is of the greatest moment to keep criminals away from each other. One of the most active visiting magistrates at the Lancashire sessions (1871) said, "That twenty years' experience in that capacity had convinced him that ninety-nine prisoners out of a hundred leave the gaols worse than they enter them." The sheriff of London and Middlesex (Mr. Croll) said some years ago, "For one prisoner reformed many are corrupted. It is to be feared that, in the great majority of

cases, imprisonment gives an impetus to the downward course of the convict." It may be true that a long term of solitary confinement induces madness, and often leads prisoners to commit suicide. But it is decidedly wrong to put comparatively innocent persons with very depraved prisoners. It would be far better to keep all prisoners separate, and let them be visited frequently by officials and Christian and philanthropic people. When they leave prison they would have a fair start in the path of honesty and industry were they allowed a share of their earnings while in gaol. If they have no trade one should be taught them. This would be a saving to ratepayers and a blessing to convicts. Clemency toward hardened offenders is cruelty to criminals and an injury inflicted on society. There must be time given, in the case of the deeply-depraved prisoners, for the formation of new habits and the growth of new ideas and emotions. To let such out of prison before these principles have taken root in some good measure at least is like permitting a patient to leave the hospital before his disease has been properly cured. The physican in such a case would expect a speedy relapse. And how can we consistently look for anything in the criminal prematurely liberated, but going back again to his old evil practices? First offences might be dealt with more mercifully than they are with advantage to all concerned, and the offender told in case of future guilt severe punishment would be inflicted. We do not mean that a wise compassion is never to be exercised. Considerable discretion ought to be left to judges and magistrates, because of peculiar cases which turn up in the course of circumstances. As to penal servitude for life, that

is sanctioned by the case of Cain (Gen. iv. 12—15). Capital punishment apparently was sanctioned by the word of God in olden time (Gen. ix. 6). Many good men think capital punishment might now be abolished, and imprisonment for life substituted. Be this as it may, some prisoners appear incurable. Only the Christian method of improvement will be of any use to many. Might it not be better to attempt its application more extensively to prisoners? But we have discussed this subject elsewhere. The principal interest at present appears to centre in the case of juvenile criminals. It does appear unwise to send young criminals to prison. If the present law were amended, as it is likely to be, and juveniles were sent to a reformatory school, it would be better in every way. There is much to be said for the following method of dealing with juvenile offenders.

"Lord Norton, discussing the question of the treatment of juvenile offenders, advocates an amendment of the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, and the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879. To this, he says, may be added provisions for taking security from parents for their children's better conduct, and in some cases fining the negligent parent; while in all cases more means should be given for preventing any parent from saving himself the cost of a child's maintenance by his neglect. At the same time reformatories and industrial schools should not keep children from getting out to work as soon as they are fit to train for their posts in life and to earn their own support."

Looking at human brotherhood in its relation to the *land laws* of our country, we are led to ask, Is it a fair and right

thing that the whole estate should go by law to the first-born son, who is no nearer in relationship to the parents than the last-born child? Is such a law, rendering such a state of things possible, a just law, a law equal and righteous in itself, wise and beneficial in its operation in society? We are not dealing with antisocial ideas, not having the least faith in Socialism and Communism. So far from property being a sin, we believe that law must ever defend property. But society is above the individual; and so no one man has a right to dispose of his property in a way which will interfere with the general good. The Government acts upon this idea when it compels a person to sell his land for a railway or for public works. Private and personal interests must give way for the public good, because the nation is greater than the man. And yet some people appear to think and act as if they were absolute owners of their property, as if nobody else had any right to get any good out of it; as if indeed society had no lawful concern with the application and disposal of such property. They conclude that they have a moral right to entail their estates indefinitely to their posterity, so that these estates shall under no circumstances be sold or bartered. Now properly looked at property is held in trust for the public good; and the power of persons over property is confined to such objects and within such limits as are consistent with the welfare of society. It is most assuredly not for the public good that the estates of men should become unproductive, or "stagnant possessions" as it is forcibly put by one writer. And yet where there is unlimited entail does not this sometimes occur? If a man is impoverished in means and cannot sell a portion of the

estate, the houses and land get worse year by year. He has not the money to improve the land and repair the buildings. He has simply a life-interest in the estate, and is obliged to pay each brother and sister so much out of it. Under proper management and with moderate capital, the estate would be far more productive than it is. We say in such a case this is not merely a personal, but a social and national loss. It affects the farmer, the cottager, in fact all on the estate; nay it affects the whole community. Instead of productiveness there is barrenness. Instead of material comfort and prosperity there is wretchedness and want. Instead of schools springing up and flourishing on the estate there is ignorance, misery, and vice. This is no mere imaginary sketch. It has all come to pass in numerous instances within the last century. We regard it as a reckless trampling upon the laws of human brotherhood simply to legislate for the purpose of keeping up caste. We are not speaking against the aristocracy of Britain, which we sincerely honour and firmly believe it to be the finest in Europe. But when persons by their incompetence or sin or neglect or anything else have ruined their estates, such persons are no longer any credit to their class, and might by the just decrees of Providence be allowed to go down quietly into obscurity, and so give place to some worthier and better people. Simplify the transfer of land, render its acquisition easier, and men of means will gladly invest in it, and the soil will be properly cultivated for the general good. Yes, and another thing is not to be forgotten here. Landowners ought to be compelled to part with land at a fair value, for public convenience and necessity. How difficult it has often been to secure land for the

drainage of large towns. How difficult too to secure proper sites for public buildings, and ground for the healthful recreation of the people. But infinitely worse than all this, it has often been absolutely impossible to secure a fitting site for a Nonconformist place of worship. Landowners have sometimes practically said, Liberty of worship shall not be known on my estates. How long shall this state of things exist in Christian England?

The *Daily News*, Oct., 1880, clearly and forcibly puts the land laws before us, commenting on Mr. Baxter's speech at Montrose. "The real grievance is, as Mr. Baxter points out, not that the great landed proprietors own so much land, but that they do not own it. A large majority of them are tenants for life and cannot sell an acre except under the stringent conditions of some trust deed, one of which almost invariably is that the proceeds of the sale should be invested in the purchase of fresh land. This power of fettering posterity must be taken away. It used to be thought clever to say that there was in England no law of primogeniture, but only a custom. This method of displaying mental superiority is perhaps rather at a distance. To say nothing of entailed estates the number of persons possessed of landed property who annually die intestate is quite sufficient to make a perceptible difference in the devolution of the soil, independently of the encouragement which the law gives to a bad habit. The Cabinet will, we trust, see their way to the entire abolition of settlements upon any unborn person, if not of settlements altogether. The Lord Chancellor, whose acquaintance with the subject is surpassed by none, will not allow professional instincts or prejudice

to interfere with a statesman-like solution of this great question."

Human brotherhood teaches that *there ought to be deep and strong sympathy between class and class.* The higher classes have duties to perform to the lower classes, and the lower classes have duties to render to the higher classes. We long to see the time when the higher classes will cease to look suspiciously upon the growing intelligence of the lower classes, and when the lower classes will cease to distrust the higher classes. God knows we have hardly any higher wish for our country than to see a wise and happy blending of class with class to promote and secure the good of all. We have known many rich men think, and scheme, and give, for the mental, moral and social improvement of the poorer classes; and we have known many poor men who have thoroughly appreciated and really deserved the attentions of the rich. Sometimes we have blessed God for allowing us personally to know some who were rich and some who were poor, because our ideal of human nature has been raised. We have often said it shall be ours by the blessing of God to do all in our power to bind poor and rich together; to soothe the irritation felt by the poor man as he looks up from his poverty and wretchedness to the comfort and abundance of the rich; and to enlist the thought, kindly feeling, and wise action of the intelligent and wealthy on behalf of the suffering poor. These are objects almost as dear to our heart as life itself, or we should never have consumed the few leisure moments in a busy life, or deprived ourselves of much needed rest to write this book. We know the horny hand of the poor man does not merely toil for himself and his

little ones, but for the good of society generally. We know too that the educated and wealthy do not read and write and discuss for themselves simply, but for the good of the nation and the race. He is not the friend of his kind, not the helper of poor or rich, not the benefactor of his country, who attempts to widen the breach already existing between the different classes of society; but he is the true man who sincerely strives to bring and bind the classes together in one glorious brotherhood. And though ignorance on the one hand, and selfishness on the other, may indefinitely delay the proper acknowledgment of human brotherhood, yet it will ultimately become a precious and realised truth.

> "For a' that, and a' that,
> It's coming yet for a' that,
> That man to man the warld o'er
> Shall brothers be for a' that."

When the towns are under better sanitary regulation we hope there will not be the present *separation of the classes in actual life.* God meant the poor and rich to live together, as well as the believers and unbelievers to exist together in the same community, that one might help and bless the other. Christ prayed not that His disciples should be taken out of the world, but that they might be kept from the evil. The intelligent, moral, upright people are not to be separated from the opposite class of characters in ordinary life. Yet the separation of the classes in our large towns and cities largely amounts to a violation of this arrangement of Christ. The ignorant, the uneducated, the evil-disposed are too much left to themselves in the centre of towns, and the salt that should season society is

mostly taken away. The most difficult social problems will have to be solved in the large centres of population. The bad and ignorant are gravitating to the centre of big towns, and the masters and well-to-do people are going to the suburbs. We do not mean that all are bad who live in the centre of towns, and that all good and wise folks live in the suburbs. We speak only of a general fact. And this widening separation of the dwellings of rich and poor, and the consequent diminishing of intercourse between the higher and lower classes of the community, act unfavourably upon the character of both rich and poor. Let them dwell together more, act and react on each other, and all will be benefited and the theory of brotherhood will sooner become a fact and a life.

We must cultivate a forbearing and a forgiving spirit toward our brother, and not indulge in class hatred. God bears long with us; and when we have confessed our sin and asked for pardon, He has readily forgiven us. Now God's conduct in this respect must be the model of our own. The Great Father's example must be followed by us. But most of us will often have observed though God may forgive a man, society does not readily do so. How many cases we can easily call up in our memory, in which though the Lord has forgiven a public sinner society has treated him as if still guilty, shunned him, scorned him, and sometimes hated and persecuted the man. Heaven pardons, earth refuses to do so. The slip a man made is not forgotten and forgiven, though the Sovereign and Judge of the race has completely cancelled the evil act. It is thrown up to the man, and to the offspring of the man when he himself has gone to the grave. Perhaps it is right socially

considered, that an element of punishment should ever cling to some moral crimes. But human society is whimsical and capricious in its forgiveness. Some sorts of public sins it easily passes over and very readily pardons; but other public sins, not so bad morally speaking, it will by no means condone or excuse. Society has burnt, imprisoned, crucified, though the crime committed has been trifling; and then almost immediately has forgiven notorious sins. Some crimes at times are regarded as public virtues. The evil-doers are applauded, extolled as patriots, worshipped as heroes, held up to society as the saviours of their race, as in Ireland and France by the Fenians and Communists. We do not mean when we speak of cultivating a merciful and forgiving spirit, that those wretches who shoot down their fellows shall escape punishment. By the law of justice we are bound to imprison and banish our brother in some instances; and self-protection or the protection of the weak and helpless requires the adoption of severe measures to repress crime. Penal servitude or transportation for life appears to be sanctioned by the case of Cain (Gen. iv. 12, 15). But mercy is an element to be considered in the worst cases, and a principle to be acted upon especially where there is evidence of repentance and reformation. We do not say that ticket-of-leave men should not be under strict surveillance, and the utmost possible care exercised in granting tickets-of-leave. Yet as God dealt mercifully with the murderer, and protected Cain from the revenge of society, as seen in the above reference, so we should blend mercy with justice in extreme cases, and in ordinary ones be very ready to give as light punishment as justice will allow. And when an offence is

committed against us personally, and the offending party apologises and asks our pardon, we are bound to forgive him not once merely, but until seventy times seven. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father in heaven forgive you your trespasses."

Human brotherhood implies that we should teach men their worldly interests, and yet we have not only left our brother man ignorant of the rudiments of education in ten thousand instances, *but ignorant of the common things of life which were essential to his getting on to the greatest possible personal advantage.* In the daily struggle going on in the commercial world, the last thing that appears to enter the minds of many is that they are really brethren. So far from instructing men in matters concerning their interests, the too common practice is to keep them ignorant as far as possible, and to take advantage of that ignorance. How little of that true and lofty justice we find, which respects and acknowledges the rights of others in all the circumstances of life, and which saves men from that intense selfishness of human nature which so frequently leads people to think and act as if nobody had any kind of rights but themselves. How little again of that impartial truth we find which acknowledges the claims of men upon our moral honesty and integrity, and guards mankind against all kinds of deception, in word and in deed. And especially how little of that genuine charity we find which acknowledges the claims of men upon our acts of kindness, our deep pity, and broad compassion. "Yes," men say, "but these are not principles to take into the market and to act upon in the business dealings of life. What we have to keep to in the business transactions of life is justice." So then are we to understand that men

may be Christians on one point only when doing business; and that all the other elements of their religion they may leave at home when they are going into the world to deal with their fellows? We fear the exhibition of a mutilated Christianity like that has done much to hinder the progress of the Gospel. And if in human dealings mercy is shut out, all the kindly sentiments of the soul banished, and nothing but hard, cold, stern justice left, then we see nothing for the race governed only by this one law of procedure but ever-increasing wretchedness. The generous emotions must be exhibited. We must tell men what is best for them; show them how to get on and to do well for themselves and their families. If we reduce religion to the one narrow bald principle of justice, which appears to be a favourite method with writers on commercial life in this age, then a crippled Christianity will very soon find difficulty in keeping on its feet, and society will have to look out for the restoration of primitive beliefs and principles of action. If men were not brothers it would not matter much how they treated each other; but since they are they must be both just and generous, bearing one another's burdens, and so fulfilling the law of Christ.

A proper recognition of human brotherhood would put an end to *strikes in trade, which are as bad for the men as for the masters.* The interests of masters and men are really one. What is for the good of the masters is for the good of the men, and what is for the good of the men is for the good of the masters. What is for the good of the many is for the good of the few, and what is for the good of the few is for the good of the many. We simply mean that human interests properly understood do not clash. It is when

they are misunderstood and wrongly interpreted that they come into collision. God is the Great Father of the race, and has taught us that our brotherhood should regulate and harmonise the interests of the different classes of society. The proverb, "Live and let live," has its origin deep down in the conviction of human brotherhood, and contains much sound Christian philosophy. When this is forgotten or practically ignored either by masters or by men, then comes a war of interests, or a war of classes, and all the awful consequences of social war.

"It is in the interest of the rich," said Bellairs more than two hundred years ago, "to take care of the poor." Rousseau used to say, "When the poor have nothing to eat, they will eat the rich." And when they deem themselves wronged they will strike, which Mr. Mundella, who is no mean judge on a subject like this, declares to be "in the industrial world what wars are in the political." We do not mean for one moment to intimate that all the justice in strikes is on the side of the men. They are often wrong toward themselves, wrong toward the masters, and wrong toward society generally. The strikes have frequently been blind and ignorant ones, and everybody has had to suffer in most cases either directly or indirectly. Most of all the men themselves have had to suffer, "giving," as a shrewd working man observed, "twopence for a penny." Differences between masters and men must sooner or later be settled by arbitration.

At present things are sadly out of joint. The frequent and foolish strikes among working men have put matters seriously wrong. They have not always as carefully considered the interests of the master as they wish the master

to consider the interests of the men. They have not even pondered the elements of political economy, but too commonly acted with a narrowness, shortsightedness, and blind prejudice that is sure to be fatal to the interests of the artisan, to say nothing whatever of the interests of the capitalist. And in some instances the strikes have been so unjust and ruinous to the masters that it positively becomes necessary to plead with the working man for the brother above him in social position. Common justice and brotherly consideration apply to those above us as well as to those below us. Let this be distinctly understood, admitted, and acted upon and matters will soon wear another aspect. If not let working men look out for some periodical or chronic commercial crisis that will throw them out of employment; or remember that scarcity of work may come by the wealthier classes refusing to procure anything but what is absolutely necessary till things have got into a better condition. And what do working men ultimately get by strikes? Only a few hours less toil a week. Though they obtain an increase of wage, by the men striking all round, everything goes up in price, so that they are precisely where they were. Having said so much in the interest of working men in other parts of this work, it is only fair we should remind the artisan that the side of the master should be fully taken into consideration. One-sided views cannot ultimately benefit anybody, and they ought not either. It is safest and best for everybody calmly to look on all sides of a subject. And we do earnestly hope that commercial gentlemen will just now take wise and comprehensive views of things, and not get too much alarmed because of the struggle between capital and labour. There

always have been disagreements between masters and men. By-and-by matters will settle down and find their proper level. We are aware that some may be ruined first. But what we fear is lest persons who have their money in business will go to extremes—either retire from business, or turn round upon the working classes and leave their poorer brethren to help themselves. We have reason for dreading some such line of action. Recently two or three facts have come under our notice which to some extent confirm our worst fears. A very respectable and influential firm in the north of England some little time ago had two orders for goods, amounting in each case to £200,000, and declined both orders on the ground of the state of working men. The same firm purchased a large mill with the view of adapting it to their particular use and employing a large number of men; but it remains as it was, and it is determined the money shall sleep till a better state of things dawns. Another party was accustomed to give yearly £100 to an infirmary. When his hands got an increase of wage he told them if they would each give a penny a week he would continue his subscription. They refused, and he said, "Then I won't give a penny." Another gentleman who has been accustomed generously to give £300 a year for the benefit of the working classes, says he will henceforth leave them to themselves. Now it is this violent and extreme conduct that we trust will be avoided. The confusion, the unsettled state of things, is only temporary. After a while all will come right again; and in the meantime let men who have done much for the lower classes not abandon their principles, but hold firmly by the laws of humanity.

Human brotherhood should *influence the commercial trans-*

actions of nations, as well as of communities within themselves. There ought to be a true brotherhood of nations. Nation should teach nation its temporal and commercial interests, as well as class teach class within the nation. We would ever advocate a noble and unselfish brotherliness as the truest political economy, because it is the political economy of God. Political economy as taught in these days, teaches how a nation may grow rich or use its means to the greatest possible advantage, vainly imagining that it will be happy when great and prosperous. No, it must be good before being contented and happy. Nations like individuals must do right, and "love the brotherhood," before they are able to "rejoice evermore." Not act on principles of expediency or mere ideas of utility, but carry out the will of God. And nations like persons may do wrong to others, not only by acting but by refusing to act a brotherly part.

Were the doctrine of human brotherhood universally admitted and acted upon, *it would make an end of slavery.* Man is the keeper of his brother, and yet he holds him in the most cruel and degrading slavery,—buys and sells him as he does his cattle, puts him on a level with his goods and chattels. And if the inquiry be proposed, "Am I not a man and a brother?" the answer is often both verbally and practically, "No." He is cruelly disowned. With the same warm, red blood in his veins, with a mind to think and a heart to feel, with a soul keenly alive to the wrong done him, his brotherhood remains theoretically and practically unacknowledged. Standing erect as he does, looking towards heaven whence he came like ourselves, and whither by God's blessing he is tending, his fellows still dare to bind him in chains and slavery. With an intellect

capable of lofty conceptions, and a heart susceptible of the deepest and tenderest emotions, he is crushed, wronged, disowned; and yet God tells us that we must "honour all men." The human heart says so too, but its voice is hushed. Not however till the kindlier feelings of nature have undergone a hardening process can man bring himself thus to treat those who in the eyes of reason, justice, and Scripture are regarded as his equals and fellows. But heaven is the friend of the slave, the Christian is the friend of the slave, and humanity true to itself is everywhere the friend of the slave; and though downtrodden and oppressed for ages, the slave will ere long rise to take his proper place among his brethren. There is a day coming when with the greatest cordiality and affection the slave will be embraced by all with the frank and honest confession, "We be brethren." Our brotherhood is taught us in the very first sentence of the Lord's Prayer, and no untruth and injustice will be permitted to stand for ever. When we remember what has occurred in the West Indies and in the United States of America, within the memory of living men, we gather hope for the race. Spain must wash her hands of the vile traffic in human nature; slavery, under the name of "free labour," must be completely abolished; Europeans must treat the negro with consideration and humanity. We only wish missionaries and missionary societies could see their way clear to publish the acts of cruelty perpetrated by white people on the poor blacks, such as cutting off ears and putting out eyes, all concealed for the sake of respectable living relatives in many cases. It is not pleasant to dwell on the overcrowding of slave-ships, and deeds of the deepest cruelty done to the

negro by Europeans, but the facts cannot be denied. Some gentlemen say, "Yes, all this is quite right and proper; but would you like to be very closely associated in life with the 'greasy niggers?'" Well for the matter of that we should not like to be associated with dirty whites. We must improve the negro, and make him a fit companion for us: he is capable of all this. The Rev. Joseph Gaskin, at the annual meeting of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, in Exeter Hall (1872), said: "We thought a little while ago that slavery was dead, that the slave-trade was a monstrosity of the past; but I read the other day, in the report of the Australian Conference, that not only recently, but for some time past, things which are disgraceful to humanity had been taking place in the South Seas." All appeals to Government failed till the murder of a bishop and his chaplain opened the eyes of the authorities. The murderers had their towns bombarded; and Mr. Gaskin asks, "Who is to go and bombard the murderers and slave-hunters, those men who provoked this terrible retaliation?" He further says: "Slavery in Africa has recently assumed awful proportions. The slavery of the West Indies, the slavery of America, are as nothing when we consider what is now going on there. The whole of the interior of the continent is a slave-ground; from the northern to the southern settlements the whole country is given up to this slave-trade." It is calculated that seventy thousand slaves are annually deported from the country, and that for every slave, from five to ten human beings fall; and at a very moderate computation, half a million of the human race is being destroyed by this accursed traffic every year. Our brother in Africa lies oppressed and bleeding to-day!

In June, 1880, "a deputation from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society had an interview with Earl Granville, to urge the suppression of the slave-trade in the Soudan and Upper Nile and at Mozambique. Sir George Campbell introduced the deputation, and presented a memorial from the society, who advocated the appointment of consuls at Khartoum and Massowah and Yeddah, as they considered that the slave-trade could not be extinguished by temporary appointments or spasmodic efforts, however energetic. For his own part, Sir George Campbell said he had no faith in the pashas at Constantinople, and nothing but a strong hand would be successful.

"Lord Granville said, in reply, that it was forty years since he first came into the Foreign Office, and what struck him most was the amount of individual labour that Lord Palmerston expended in order to abolish the slave-trade. For himself he had never forgotten the lesson that had been taught him then as a young man. There were two subjects touched upon by the deputation—the existence of slavery in the Mozambique and in Egyptian territory, and the other was with regard to the continuance of the slave-trade. Sir G. Campbell spoke of the great change which had taken place in India in that respect; but whatever pressure the Government was prepared to exercise in India, it was a different matter when we had to deal with a country which we were not ourselves governing. With respect to the existence of slavery, there was great truth in what had been said by the deputation. However, recent reports both from Mozambique and Egypt were more favourable, and in April a very large seizure of slaves had been made. There was no doubt that there was a great

deal of connivance by the local authorities at this slave-trade; and he agreed with the deputation that consular supervision was a good means of obtaining information, and he thought that supervision might be extended. At the same time, he thought that Khartoum being a very unhealthy place we ought to have some very good reasons assigned for its being a consular station.

"Mr. Sturge said that Khartoum had been fixed upon by several eminent authorities.

"Lord Granville said a scheme was now under the consideration of the Government dealing with the subject, but he did not pledge himself to adopt the exact recommendation of the deputation. However, he would be glad to be supplied with all possible information on the subject."

Were the doctrine of human brotherhood properly carried out *it would terminate war*. Man is brother to man, and yet he slays him on the battle-field, indulges in the wholesale butchery of his fellows. We do not say that there are no circumstances which justify war; but war ought never to be undertaken for mere conquest, or the acquisition of territory, or to gain power among the nations. Abraham was a kind of model warrior. He only fought in self-defence, and when he had won the battle would not take from the enemy from a thread to a shoe-latchet. A weak race ought not to be oppressed by a strong race, crushed and tyrannised over by a powerful neighbour. History has something awful to teach us on these points with reference to the various nations and tribes of the earth; and as a people our hands are not altogether clean before God in India and elsewhere. If war be waged for the pride of conquest or the love of power, or the lust of territory, or

to suit the whims of potentates, or the ambition of nations, or for what is improperly called glory—what is it in all such instances but wholesale murder in cool blood? It may be legalised by civilised nations, but civilisation without Christianity is cruel and barbarous. Some of the late wars on the continent of Europe are dark blots on modern civilisation. Going back to the days of Alexander the Great and Napoleon Bonaparte, from ambition or revenge they did not stick at extensive murder unprovoked and on any ground unjustifiable. But we were fondly dreaming that nations had grown wiser and more humane, until the beautiful dream was rudely broken by the most horrible and unnecessary war on record—the late bloody contest between Germany and France. It is when we gaze upon two great and powerful nations struggling in deadly grip, as in the above case, that we especially learn the cruel character of modern war. War is a most irrational method of settling a dispute between nations. It is not an appeal to reason but to physical force. If we were not created rational beings there might be some justification in having recourse to brute force in arranging our national disputes. But as it is, war is condemned by reason itself. It is also a most unjust thing. The principle on which war proceeds is that might is right. Now as a matter of fact the strongest nation may be the most unrighteous, cruel, and tyrannical. And simply because a nation is the strongest it crushes a weak nation, and robs that nation of its just rights and interests. We need not go into particulars; the history of nations furnishes ample illustration. Our first duty is to enlighten and convince the peoples of Europe. When the conviction is complete the way will be found for settling

national disputes by arbitration. We have now trial by jury; and why should there not be national juries to settle national quarrels? Napoleon once said, "Providence is on the side of the strongest battalions." But he also said another thing, "There are but two powers in the world, mind and the sword, and in the long run mind prevails." Duelling has almost been entirely put down by enlightened public opinion. And war is only a national duel, which will sooner or later disappear by the same enlightened conviction spread among the nations. When Christians learn to hate war as they detest slavery, war will soon cease. Ministers and people too commonly speak of the horrible butchery as if it were a glorious and heroic thing, when really it can only be at all tolerated in cases of self-defence, if always then. How relieving to the mind to turn away from the awful destruction of human life, the waste of property, the crippling of the means and resources of the nation, the making of widows and orphans by thousands, and all the untold cruelties and abominations of war, so commonly marked by deeds worse than death,—to the calm contemplation of the age when men "shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks." What a happy change will come over the face of things! John Foster says, "From the death of Abel to this day the world's history has been written in blood." But when the latter-day glory dawns each man will be looked upon, embraced, and loved as a child of the same great and blessed Parent. Let us live and labour in anticipation of the glorious era, and amid the darkness and confusion of the present do our best to hasten the oncoming of the period when war shall be no more.

Standing armies curse and crush Christendom to-day. In the nineteenth century of Christianity, professedly Christian nations are armed to the teeth. And these immense standing armies are made a strong temptation to try their virtue on somebody. When a boy has a whip and is irritated by another boy who happens to have none, it is very tempting to the boy armed with the grand weapon to use it on the offender. And it is very much like this with kings and peoples in Europe and America to-day. If an army is ready for the field, the nation so prepared, under wounded pride, or disappointment, or the slightest provocation, may hurry that army into the field and reflect afterwards or repent at leisure. It has been so in the past, and will probably be so again in the future.

Lord Reay in a very able address delivered to the Social Science Congress, Edinburgh, 1880, says: "What is the prevailing tone on the Continent on the great subject of international affairs? Every Government is convinced that it must be armed to the teeth; that it is threatened by some mysterious force which only future events will unfold. If we were to repeat the proposal of disarmament made by our Government in 1866, we should be met everywhere by a courteous and decided refusal." He further says: "Supposing, for instance, that we—from the best of motives and for the best of reasons—endorsed the policy of one or more of the great Powers, disarmament would not be the result, but a fresh stimulus would simply be given to the armaments of those Powers whose policy might be supposed to be uncongenial to ourselves. A policy of neutrality, of very strict neutrality, not tinted by hostility towards a single Power, but benevolent towards every one of them,

friendly to the last degree to the smaller Powers, is the natural result of the existing state of things. A neutral policy is essentially different from a policy of non-intervention, which existing treaties forbid, and which our interests everywhere render an impossibility. The policy of non-intervention once having been proclaimed would, through the false impression it must needs create in other nations as to our character, lead to the very results which it was intended to avoid. A watchful and reserved neutrality, on the other hand, will be a discouragement to other Powers to treat our advice, in the rare instances when it should be given, with anything but respect, and will restrain their aggressive tendencies, because a policy of neutrality not being identical with a policy of non-intervention, may cease the moment circumstances call for its abandonment. Probably alone, of all Powers, ours is the one whose statesmen, if they take the trouble to ascertain the real aspirations of foreign statesmen, which are frequently at variance with their written and spoken utterances, can attain a position which will make them listened to with respect in every capital."

We do not see the great difference there is between a policy of neutrality and a policy of non-intervention. Probably all intelligent politicians who advocate non-intervention would not contend that it required us to abstain from the defence of our true interests in any unjust war made upon us by other nations.

"Let us accept the facts," Lord Reay says again, "as they are, and deal with them, not in a fanciful, but in a manly way. A day may come for an idyllic and romantic school of politicians. It is not the day in which we live.

We have to be on our guard against being eclipsed by our own kith and kin. We have laid the foundations of the American, of the Australian social systems. Should those social systems prove more robust than our own; should they give birth to a literature, to an art, to an agriculture, to manufactures more thriving than our own; should they be able to satisfy the wants of the people in a higher degree, then our decadence will begin. Their rivalry may, I am convinced, be turned into a source of strength, if their aims and ours coincide. United by free trade, by individual liberty, a glorious prospect is before us. The Anglo-Saxon world is a planetary system in itself. It moves in its own orbit. The voices of Anglo-Saxons all over the world murmur with no uncertain sound what is the duty of English statesmen. Do not seek, they murmur, to adjust the balance of power. Do not attempt to meddle with the internal constitution of other States. Do not pretend to be arbiters of the destinies of the world. Do not enter into engagements which are not imperatively required. Do not fetter in any way our freedom, unless freedom itself is threatened. Prevent any attack being made on the independence of the weaker States of Europe. Promote concert whenever and wherever you can, leaving the responsibility to those States who decline to co-operate for a good object, and to ward off perils. Increase the fund of prosperity to be distributed among Her Majesty's subjects in England, in Canada, in Australia, in India, in Africa."

It may not be the time for national disarmament in Europe. We do not say that it is. But are we to go on manufacturing more and yet more destructive implements

of war, spending larger and yet larger sums of money on our army and navy, till we can hardly live under the taxes levied for military purposes, without asking ourselves where is all this leading us, and what will be the final outcome for us and for others? When we think of the millions upon millions of money spent annually in Europe for the destruction of life and property; when we think further of the hundreds of thousands of men called soldiers existing as non-producers of labour; and when we think finally that this system is paraded before our youth as the "glory of our arms" and "the glory" of our country, we imagine it is time to consider whether or not there is a more rational and Christian method of national procedure. When Christian Sociology is better understood, and when the Gospel of Jesus has more thoroughly taken hold of the minds and hearts of the people, communities and empires will wonder that they existed so long simply to destroy one another. The outlook is dark enough at present; but the dark cloud is not without its silver lining.

The proper recognition of human brotherhood *would put an end to the opium trade*, excepting for medicinal purposes. No one can make himself familiar with the facts on this subject without coming to the conclusion that opium smoking is a source of unspeakable misery to the Chinese; that enlightened conviction holds England responsible to a large extent for this misery; and that Englishmen of all creeds and of all classes of society ought to use their utmost influence to bring this iniquitous traffic to an end. A Manchester paper says: "At the noon prayer-meeting at the Young Men's Christian Association Rooms, Peter-street, Manchester, June, 1880, the Rev. G. Mabbs, of London,

delivered an address upon the opium traffic in the East, and its effects upon the progress of Christianity in that part of the world. He sketched the history of the traffic in India and China, and dwelt upon the support which had been given to it by the English Government. In the year 1800 the amount of opium imported into China from India was, he said, about 5,000 chests, but at the present time the quantity introduced into that country, against the wish of the Chinese themselves, is more than 90,000 chests. The effects of the opium pipe upon the people of China were of the most disastrous character, both physically and morally. The Chinese were fully aware of its evil influence, and they not unnaturally expressed their doubts as to the good intentions of missionaries and other Englishmen who endeavoured to spread the Gospel amongst them, but who were subjects of a Government which upheld a traffic which was destroying the vigour and manhood of the country." We deem it preferable to cite the opinions of the best authorities in their own language on a subject like this. English Ambassadors, Ministers, and Consuls; gentlemen who hold positions of eminence under the Indian, Chinese, and American Governments; merchants, missionaries, travellers, and Select Committees of the House of Commons, all furnish evidence of a most unquestionable character as to the infliction of moral and physical injury by the opium trade with China. Almost the whole of foreign opium consumed by the Chinese reaches that country from India. The financial advantage reaped by the Indian Government from the sale of opium deeply compromises the honour of our country. Sir Cecil Beadon, successively secretary to the Board of Revenue in India,

secretary to the Government of Bengal, and afterwards Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, is reported, in a Parliamentary paper on East Indian Finance, to have said as follows :—

"3195. Chairman—Has the existing mode of raising the revenue from opium been in force for a very long time in Bengal?—Yes; almost since the commencement of our rule in Bengal.

"3195. You know that the production of opium in Bengal has been gradually growing for a number of years?—Yes.

"3205. Is there any regulation by which the Government limit the extent of the land so cultivated, or do they always accede to every request?—It is limited according to the financial needs of the Government; it is limited entirely upon Imperial considerations. The Government of India, theoretically at least, if not practically, decide how much opium they will bring to market; and, of course, upon that depends the quantity of land that they will put under cultivation and make advances for.

"3243. Can you give the results of the operations for 1868-69?—Only in the price. In 1868-69, the total gross receipts for opium in Bengal were £6,622,225, and the total charges were £1,717,746, the net revenue being £4,904,500.

"3292. Sir C. Wingfield—Can you state what the total value of the opium sold in the districts, for what is called district consumption, is?—Yes, I can. I will take the year 1868-69; that is the latest I have. I cannot give you the number of chests, but I can tell you what the value of it is. The proceeds from the sale of Akbari opium in 1868-69 was 31 lacs 25,000 rupees, and the cost of the opium and

contingencies, and all other charges upon it, were 10 lacs and 25,000 rupees; so that the Government made a profit upon the sale of that Akbari opium of 21 lacs of rupees.

"3293. But after all, 30 lacs, £300,000, represents the value of all that proportion of the opium which is consumed by the people of India?—Yes.

"3294. The rest all comes from a foreign people?—All the rest of the revenue comes entirely from the Chinese; it is paid by them.

"3329. Mr. Fawcett—I understand you to say that opium is grown in India simply for purposes of revenue; no moral considerations at all influence the Government?—The Government only regard opium as a means of obtaining revenue.

"3330. That if, for instance, they thought they could obtain more revenue by doubling the cultivation of opium in India, they would do so, and would not be deterred from adopting such a course by any considerations as to the deleterious effect which opium might produce on the people to whom it was sold?—Probably not.

"3331. I believe the opium revenue has realised, some years, as much as £9,000,000, has it not?—From the whole of India nearly £9,000,000, I think, in one year.

"3597. The sale of opium, I think, is conducted by private auctioneering firms in Calcutta?—For many years the Government employed an auctioneering firm in Calcutta to sell the opium, and they received a commission upon the sale of the opium.

"3598. Does not that prevail at present?—I think not. I think it has been changed, and it is now sold by a Government officer."

It should be specially noted here that the present mode of raising the revenue from opium has been in force from almost the commencement of our rule in Bengal, and that Imperial considerations exclusively determine how much opium shall be produced. It should be further borne in mind that this opium is chiefly grown by a heathen people, for consumption by a heathen people, and that the Exchequer of a Christian country is largely replenished from an unchristian source like this.

Mr. Mark Stewart, in the debate in the House of Commons, quoted from the Indigo Commission the following words:—

"All the members of the department are constantly engaged in using their best endeavours to extend the cultivation (of opium) with the consent of the parties engaging, and everything in the way of fair inducement and persuasion is not only permitted but encouraged."

In the House of Commons, Mr. Pease, who seconded Mr. Stewart's motion, said: "They found Indian governors telegraphing to their subordinates to grow more opium: it is only the growth of opium will make our revenue easy."

From the Indian Finance Report, the following evidence of Mr. G. Smith, LL.D., is culled.

"5097. Does the Excise Department promote the consumption of opium in India as zealously as that of alcohol?—In the Indo-Chinese districts of British Burmah, the action of the departments in promoting the sale of opium has long been a public scandal. . . . Prior to the introduction of British rule into Aracan, the punishment for using opium was death. The people were hard-working, sober, and simple-minded. Unfortunately, one of the first measures

of our administration was the introduction of the Akbari rules by the Bengal Board of Revenue. Mr. Hind, who had passed the greater part of his long life amongst the people of Aracan, described the progress of demoralisation. Organised efforts were made by Bengal agents to introduce the use of the drug, and to create a taste for it amongst the rising generation. The general plan was to open a shop with a few cakes of opium, and to invite the young men and distribute it gratuitously. Then, when the taste was established, the opium was sold at a low rate. Finally, as it spread through the neighbourhood, the price was raised, and large profits ensued. (Mr. Hind was at the time assistant commissioner. He had a large local experience dating back to 1835.) He saw a fine healthy generation of strong men succeeded by a rising generation of haggard opium smokers and eaters, who indulged to such an extent that their mental and physical powers were alike wasted. Then followed a fearful increase in gambling and dacoity."

As to the sad effects of opium on the Chinese, we think that there can be no reasonable doubt entertained, after weighing the evidence given, both by official and non-official witnesses. The late Minister at Pekin, Sir Rutherford Alcock, before a Select Committee of East India Finance, 1871, was asked: "Can the evils, physical, moral, commercial, and political, as respects individuals, families, and the nation at large, of indulgence in this vice be exaggerated?" And his reply was as follows: "I have no doubt that when there is a great amount of evil there is always a certain danger of exaggeration; but looking to the universality of the belief among the Chinese, that whenever a man takes to smoking opium, it will be the

impoverishment and ruin of the family—a popular feeling which is universal both amongst those who are addicted to it, who always consider themselves as moral criminals, and amongst those who abstain from it, and are merely endeavouring to prevent its consumption—it is difficult not to conclude that what we hear of it is essentially true, and that it is a source of impoverishment and ruin to families."

Sir Thomas Wade, who has resided in China for thirty years, says, in the character of English minister, in a memorandum relating to the Revision of the Treaty of Tien-tsin, "I cannot endorse the opinion of Messrs. Jardine, Matheson and Co. [foremost among English mercantile firms in China], that 'the use of opium is not a curse but a comfort and a benefit to the hard-working Chinese. . .' It is to me vain to think otherwise of the use of the drug in China than as of a habit many times more pernicious, naturally speaking, than the gin and whisky drinking which we deplore at home. It takes possession more insidiously, and keeps its hold to the full as tenaciously. I know no case of radical cure. It has ensured, in every case within my knowledge, the steady descent, moral and physical, of the smoker, and it is, so far, a greater mischief than drink, that it does not, by external evidence of its effect, expose its victim to the loss of repute which is the penalty of the habitual drunkard."

Dr. S. W. Williams, formerly agent of the American Board of Foreign Missions at Canton, but for many years subsequently Secretary to the United States Legation at Peking, says :—

"Mr. Wade's experience of about thirty years is like mine, of more than forty years' residence among the

Chinese, during which time I have known only one case of thorough reformation from the habit."

Dr. Kerr, medical missionary at Canton for upwards of twenty years, writes as follows :—

"The effects of opium smoking are physical and moral. Acting through the body, it reaches the soul. While the one wastes away, the other is corrupted and degraded. While the appetite for the fascinating poison grows stronger and stronger, the moral perception becomes blunted, the sensibilities hardened, and finally the gratification of the morbid appetite becomes the controlling motive of every purpose and act."

Another medical missionary at Canton, Rev. R. H. Graves, M.D., whose testimony was brought forward in the debate in the House of Commons already referred to, says :—

"The effects of opium smoking are : 1st, *Physiologically*—excitement, evinced by nervous restlessness and talkativeness, and, as one becomes more and more addicted to the habit, loss of appetite, emaciation, a dull leaden hue, stiff movements and gait, obstinate constipation, and occasionally skin diseases ; 2nd, *Socially—loss of time,* resulting from the time required for smoking and the subsequent sleep ; *expense,* gradually exhausting a man's means, and driving him to the greatest shifts to satisfy his craving ; the gradual sapping of the strength and vigour, rendering a man more and more unfit for the duties of life ; 3rd, *Morally*—manifestation of anger under provocation, and I may add that the Chinese say that, as the use of alcoholic stimulants tends to make men hot-tempered and violent, so that of opium makes them given to lying, duplicity, and

trickery. The habit of opium smoking is more dangerous than that of taking alcohol, on account of the insidiousness of its approach, and the difficulty of escaping from its clutches. This vampire seems to suck all the moral courage out of a man; as to deeds of violence, opium must yield the palm to alcohol."

But it is unnecessary to dwell any further on the deleterious effects of opium taking; those who have read the mournful statements of De Quincey and Coleridge do not require further evidence; and if they do we fear that no amount of evidence from whatever source culled will ever convince them. On the testimony of Dr. Williams, "A Chinese scholar says it exhausts the animal spirits, impedes the regular performance of business, wastes the flesh and blood, dissipates every kind of property, renders the person ill-favoured, promotes obscenity, discloses secrets, violates the laws, attacks the vitals, and destroys life."

We make no apology for the number and length of the foregoing extracts, as we have been supremely concerned to show, from the best and most authoritative witnesses, in their own language, that our Indian Government is itself responsible for the production of opium, and that opinion works the most bitter mischief among the Chinese. Had we not given the very words of eye-witnesses, it might have been said that we had misunderstood them, and that we had exaggerated their language, and so come to unjust conclusions. And let it be finally remembered that England forced opium on China, that the opium trade has interfered with legitimate commerce, and that the opium poured by our Indian Government into China is the cause above all others which keeps Christianity out of China.

"In the missionary chapel at Amoy, the Rev. John Macgowan got into discussion with one of his auditors. He challenged his visitor to produce one instance, either from the mandarin or the literati class, of a man who was honestly endeavouring to carry out the doctrines of the Chinese sages. The visitor somewhat hesitatingly agreed that the instances were certainly very rare. Whilst in the very act of admitting this, the easy manner he had hitherto assumed in his conversation with me seemed to glide from the man, and, like a flash of lightning, a look of suppressed hatred and bitterness spread instead. 'Oh, then,' he said, 'your object in coming here is to teach us charity and benevolence, and truth and uprightness, is it?' I said, 'Yes.' 'If this be your object, then, why is it that you yourselves act in a spirit so directly the reverse of these, and force upon us instead your abominable opium? If your nation believes in these doctrines as Divine, why has it imported this poisonous stuff to bring poverty, distress, and ruin throughout our land?' And as he went on he became excited, and his eye flashed, and, as his eloquence grew, Chinaman-like he rolled his head from side to side, whilst the congregation, which in the meantime had grown largely, looked on with approving sympathy." The missionary felt that he had no reply, while his troublesome opponent effectually clenched the argument in the following biting language: "There is no use in your trying to get out of the matter by saying that you have nothing to do with this opium system: your country has. It is your nation, England, that is responsible for all the ruin caused by opium. It was the English guns that compelled our Emperor to sanction the trade, and it is through England that it may

be sold throughout the length and breadth of the land, without our Government being able to do anything effectual to prevent its spread throughout the kingdom."

In all debates the one reply made to all arguments is this, "The question is purely one of finance." It was so urged by the East India Company in 1817 ; it was the plea in 1843 when Lord Shaftesbury moved a resolution in the House of Commons condemning the opium trade with China, as "damaging to our legitimate commerce, and utterly inconsistent with the honour and duty of a great Christian country." It was so too in 1870, and again in 1875. This is always likely to be the sole argument with the Government and with Indian financiers, till the national sense of shame is thoroughly aroused, and the English conscience says this national sin shall not be committed any longer. We will not sell our virtue and our honour for the most splendid revenue. As "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproof to any people," we will not for gain murder our brother in the Celestial Empire, but in honest Christian fashion conduct ourselves nationally and individually, asking God in mercy to us to forgive the black and bitter past.

As nations are dealt with on earth, and do not exist in their national character in another world, the chastisement may come to us sooner than we expect. What if as the Chinese are beginning to hint, governments should conjointly make requests that opium should no longer be forced on China. Is it not good national policy to prepare for a coming storm ?

The teachings of human brotherhood are in every way valuable and comprehensive. A man may be very poor,

and yet he is your own brother. Dwelling amid hunger and poverty and squalor, with nothing to call his own—a very beggar at your door, a houseless, homeless, unpitied wanderer in the great cold world, he is still your brother. He may be morally bad, yet he is a brother, though deeply fallen. The greatest drunkard, blasphemer, libertine, the man steeped in sin, completely covered over with crime and evil deeds, the vilest and most loathsome wretch that ever crawled on God's green earth, is indeed your brother. He may be very distant or very near, in the ends of the earth or at your own door, across the seas or in your island home; yet through the wide world man of every colour or clime is your brother. The brotherhood is strictly and definitely universal. Let the nations learn it, and the strong cease to oppress the weak, not acting as if might were right; let Churches learn it, become philanthropic, and with a dutiful compassion toil for the regeneration of the race; let masters learn it, and become considerate toward servants; let the rich learn it, and become wisely charitable toward the poor; let the young learn it, till the big boy ceases to thrash the little boy who is poor and an orphan, and has no big brother to defend him; let all learn it, from the monarch on the throne to the peasant in the hut; and so learn it that it will not merely be acknowledged by the intellect, but also by the heart and life, binding man to man and class to class throughout the world.

It is only by taking a brotherly and Christian interest in one another that the social condition of the people can be effectually improved. Without this the future will be very much like the past; and bribery, drunkenness, pauperism,

crime, the separation of the classes of society, class hatred, contentions between masters and men, strikes, lock-outs, heartburnings at home; and abroad slavery, war, the opium trade, and all the abominations of heathenism. God has made us of one blood that we may be of one heart and of one religion; that we may have one standard of right, and be influenced by one law of morality; and that the whole intercourse of the race may educate the vast family for dwelling together in the one house in the skies. Shall we thwart our Heavenly Father's loving purpose?

III.

BROTHERHOOD IN ITS SPIRITUAL ASPECTS.

CHAPTER I.

IMPROVED METHODS OF CHRISTIAN WORK.

EVERY one who begins to work earnestly for the good of the people feels the need of social reforms. Without these social reforms attempting to elevate the outcasts is like rolling a great stone up a mountain. Our past methods of work have been incomplete. We have gone on too commonly making Christianity a thing simply for the soul and eternity; and have not sufficiently considered man's material wants and the conditions of his daily life. We have not sat down and mastered all the elements of the problem we tried to solve; and so we have introduced confusion into important questions and reached wrong conclusions. It is time that we should begin to look at all the surrounding facts, and to see if there be not certain left-out elements in our calculations; if we have not been wrongly stating the problem we set ourselves to solve, and so got wrong results as a consequence. We have gone on preaching to poor degraded men that the body is the temple of God, and then by multiplying public-houses we have done all we could to tempt them to turn the temple of God we wanted them profoundly to respect, into a kind of common

beer barrel. We have lectured and written books on thrift, and then offered poor men the marvellous inducement of two and a half or three per cent. for their hard savings, with the further more wonderful inducement still that when they had accumulated a little money they should be cut off from parish relief in sickness, and the thriftless should get the relief instead, thus putting a premium on waste and punishing the economical. We have taught men to be chaste and to reverence womanhood, and then allowed large families of sons and daughters to sleep in the same room with their parents, without even suggesting that a curtain should be drawn across the centre to separate males and females, or without ever dreaming of supplying that curtain. We have gone on blundering in our methods, and wondered why Christianity made so little progress. We have not carefully copied all the facts in the sum we have endeavoured to work, and so we could not get the right answer. God has acted like a patient schoolmaster, and in the loud and emphatic language of our failure He has repeatedly said, "Look here; you have omitted this, and left out that, and inserted the other; put all these right and try again; you may succeed better the next time." But though He has spoken plainly and kindly and for a long time, we have gone on in guilty disregard, not half so willing to obey His voice as the child is to obey the schoolmaster. Failure has not made us look into all the facts and conditions, we have still gone on in our own narrow, stupid way, notwithstanding God has been speaking to us continually and impressively by the great want of success.

Should we not, then, look well to our methods of doing good?

Are not our methods too commonly out of joint? Do we not ordinarily refuse to regard all the facts and circumstances of life? We are very busy about the self-regarding virtues and not sufficiently concerned about the non-regarding virtues. We look at ourselves a good deal, and concentrate thought and feeling and effort on ourselves, but we do not look enough at our life in relation to others, and do not as we should attempt to make the Christian life square with the conditions and circumstances of Christian work, and the life of the community around us. The moral faculties lag behind the intellectual faculties, the intellect is keener than the conscience. You see an illustration of this in the science of the age. We do not in our Christian work take in all the facts as carefully as men of science take in all the facts in their work. Men of science would be ashamed to conduct any scientific inquiry apart from all the facts of science as we too commonly conduct our Church-work apart from all the facts and conditions of life around us. Let us learn to look at Church-life and work in relation to life generally, and to take in all the facts as carefully as the man of science does in his methods. There is much helpful work of a side character, and the Church has too long neglected this collateral work, and the spiritual work has greatly suffered because social reforms have been disregarded. We must look at overcrowding, intemperance, pauperism, dwellings for the poor, and a hundred other things we have hitherto treated as questions outside the Church and exclusively belonging to the world; and when we have got people out of sin and sinful associations, we must give them something to do to fill the mind and to keep them perpetually occupied, or they will slip back

again into evil for want of employment. We must take in all the facts and adopt methods in harmony with all the facts, or we shall miserably fail because we work out of harmony with the circumstances and conditions of life about us. Your man of science, who cared for his reputation, would not systematically ignore the laws and facts of nature. Nor would your commercial man act so inconsistently. He studies the circumstances and necessities of his customers. He makes it a first condition to find out what it is that the people about him require, and he goes to work accordingly. He makes a great display of goods, puts out a tempting advertisement, and tries to persuade the public that it is to their interest to do business with him. Beside all this he sends out his traveller to get orders; the traveller calls again and again, is very kind, cheerful and polite, and ultimately he gets an order. There is not one man of business in a thousand who would not be ashamed of working his worldly business as he works his Christian business. Now is not God's cause infinitely more important than the most momentous commercial enterprise ever set on foot? And ought not God's work, therefore, to be better done than the best work of men? When shall we learn to be thorough and complete in our Christian work, having all our wits about us and fencing our Christian work with all possible beneficial social reforms? When shall we fairly and fully face all the facts, as men of science do and as men of business mostly do also?

It is essential that we act on the lines on which we think, that we make conscience as thorough and as consistent as intellect; that we look at things not in their isolation but in all their just relations, and that we bring all our conclusions

repeatedly to the test of facts. Indeed there must be accuracy of observation and deduction in all we do. For want of this we have not thought and acted at all in harmony, have not embraced all the elements in the conditions of Christian labour, but only those which concerned our personal life and personal salvation. We have cared a good deal for ourselves, and if we have done our duty to ourselves we have seldom troubled our heads about living in some kind of Christian relation to those in the same street, or in the nearest slums and alleys to our own habitation. We have not commonly regarded the spiritual world as one grand organic whole, as men of science have looked upon the physical world as one organic whole. We have concluded that we had a perfect right to think and act as much as we liked for ourselves, and as little as we liked for anybody else. If men acted on the same method in science it would be ruinous; but people do not so readily see that it is equally ruinous to act on this method in the Christian life. And yet there is just as much mutual dependence in the spiritual world as there is in the physical world. We are as truly dependent on one another, as every part of nature is dependent on every other part. And when you press these considerations on people they say, "Oh, this kind of work is not in our way; we do not care to be connected with that rough sort of enterprise,"—without the least sense of humiliation at the violation of the order of the moral world. A man of science would blush if he violated the intellectual order, but we without any sense of shame perpetually violate the moral order. Christianity is continually set aside by Christians, and the traditions of men are adopted instead of the commandments of God.

Human opinions and human methods are taken, and the New Testament teaching gravely departed from in spirit and in letter. We see clearly enough that only truth and well-attested facts will do in our intellectual life; but in our moral life we think it enough if there be the establishment of a national system of education for children, prisons for the lawless, workhouses for the poor and the destitute, and industrial and reformatory schools for unfortunate young people,—without deep and abiding love to our neighbour and to all mankind which will lead us to think and scheme and put ourselves to considerable trouble that people may know Gospel truth, and that the truth may make them spiritually free. What a marvellous intellectual order we have in the science of the age, with its growing power and splendid achievements in every department of life and labour; and yet in close association with this what a marvellous want of intellectual order in the moral world; and with what baneful results in the pauperism, drunkenness, prostitution, mendicity, robbery, and every kind of evil which mars our Christian civilisation. Christians shut out of thought and out of heart the poor bleeding outcasts of society, often made what they are more by the sin of other people than by their own sin; and then these Christians, having shut the door of the mind and barred and bolted the outcasts from all thought and sympathy, busy themselves with their own little selfish interests, grow more and more selfish, and propagate selfishness in the class socially below them, till in strike after strike just punishment comes back upon them in the awful struggle between capital and labour; and sometimes also in the form of terrible disease.

We are quite aware that it is entirely wrong to reason as if an analogy were an argument; it is not, but only a suggestive illustration: and without identical conditions we cannot consistently look for identical results. Yet when we have made all proper allowance for the fact that the human will interferes with the moral methods prosecuted by the Christian, as nature does not interfere with the physical methods prosecuted by the scientist; still if we only properly regard all the true conditions of Christian labour we shall get wonderfully different results, by the blessing of God, from those we have got hitherto. "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth: it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." That is, the true methods of grace will be quite as effectual as the true methods of nature. God can save by us without destroying the will.

We must give up our selfish ease, and selfish pleasure, and selfish luxuries, and selfish expenditure, and selfish indulgences of all kinds. Christianity should be the death of selfishness in all forms and degrees, and the birth of a self-sacrificing and self-forgetting spirit. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; and to give His life a ransom for many." And as Christians, baptised into the mind and spirit of Christ —as the Apostle of Christ states—"None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." In life and in death selfishness is to be banished from the sphere of

the Christian. Living we must live to the Lord, in seeking the present and eternal welfare of our fellows; and dying we must die to the Lord, not from any wish to get out of the struggle before the proper time, or to forsake the field of toil before our full work is done, but to glorify God by doing His will in the time and mode of departing from earthly service to the service of immortality. These principles and this line of procedure will lift us to the highest style of man and bless everybody about us.

One fact is pretty evident to all who read and observe, namely, *that the great bulk of working men do not go to either church or chapel.* Many of them went to Sunday school when they were children, but they have never been to church or chapel since they were married; and many of them not even then, for they were married at the office of the registrar. They appear never to think of going to any place of worship. Of course many of the rich, perhaps the bulk of them, never go to God's house week-day or Sunday. At a magnificent hotel, in one of the Lancashire watering-places, a Scotch gentleman said he believed that he and his family were the only people who went to any place of worship on the Sabbath, though the large hotel was perfectly full.

We have access to the working men of England, if we go the right way about it, especially through their own class, and by lay missionaries. Ladies and gentlemen have access to them too. Miss Marsh and Miss Hopkins, Lady Hope, Miss Hill, and a host of others have abundantly demonstrated this. Yes, and gentlemen and even the much-hated parsons have access to the British workman if they act prudently. Many clergymen and many Wes-

leyan home missionaries, who have shown sympathy and tact, have had great influence with working men. We speak of the poor particularly, because the great mass of the people are poor, though we think the wealthy need evangelising as well as the poor; and this may be done by holding drawing-room meetings, and by the rich appealing to the rich in the ten thousand ways open to them through the press, the pulpit, and by personal intercourse especially.

We think it is further evident that *fine intellectual preaching will never bridge over the gulf between the Church and the neglecters of Christian worship.* Good vigorous intellect is needed, and a man without strong sense can do very little good among working men. He cannot have too much mind, and the Church should select her finest men to win over the multitudes of habitual neglecters of Christian ordinances. The very best minds in the churches are required to reach the people; men who can speak to the great heart of humanity should be given up to direct home-mission work. Men of fair intelligence and ordinary education can address regular Christian congregations, and hold the attention of those who are accustomed to religious language, or what John Foster calls a "theological dialect;" but it needs a racy, vigorous style and special tact to get and to keep hold of the attention of the masses of men unaccustomed to pulpit English.

Among the working men of England to-day there exists a good deal of infidelity of a rough general character, which says if there be a God He is good-natured and easy-going, and will not be very hard on a poor fellow who has been a bit loose and unsteady at times; which doubts the existence of any strict moral government, and regards all religion as

a great hollow pretence, even in the most sincere and the best of us. There are many spiritually proud men in fustian, some of the greatest Pharisees are in corduroy and velveteen, who daily thank God that they are not as other men are, canting hypocrites, sanctimonious Methodists, pretended saints; they get drunk twice a week, and pay tithes of all they possess to Satan. They hate parsons as non-producers of labour, love dog-racing, pigeon-flying, and all that ends in the neighbourhood of the beer-barrel. They do not fear future punishment, but will sing and be merry, live and let live, have a jolly life if only a short one; and as to the life to come, if there be one, well, they will take their chance with other people; they will be no worse off than the rest, and so they are content.

The question comes in many forms, *what is to reach and save the English working men of the age,*—and for the matter of that the masses of the English people of all classes?—for the working men are not the only men who neglect the great salvation. Not a mere intellectual Gospel, a Gospel of refinement and culture. This is powerless in the day of temptation. Neither we fear will the present comfortable middle-class Christianity of England save the multitudes of people going as sheep without a shepherd. A Christianity that wants ease and luxury and intellectual fireworks; a Christianity of outward respectability and of the thunder-and-lightning style of preaching, is not the Christianity to reach and elevate the masses; a Christianity that goes to church or chapel once on the Sabbath, that thinks it vulgar to try to save low ignorant people, and that is supremely concerned about its own good name, is not the Christianity for an age and nation like

this. And the sooner such Christianity wakes up from its selfish slumbers the better for it and the better for others.

Neither is it enough to multiply places of worship, and then to comfort yourselves, while neglecting the actual evangelisation of the multitude, by the one thought and speech so common in the comfortable middle-class Christianity of England—if people do not go to church or chapel, well, it is their own fault, as there are so many sanctuaries within easy reach. As if the number of near churches and chapels were any justification for the neglect of hearty and steady home evangelisation. Let a man simply open his shop and then fold his arms and say, "If people will not come and buy, I cannot help it," that man will probably very soon become a bankrupt. So a shopkeeper pushes business in every possible way. Let a man be sick and helpless, suffering from paralysis, the doctor must go to him, he cannot go unassisted to the doctor. And there are multitudes about us suffering from spiritual paralysis. It is this which constitutes their claim to our sympathy and help. They cannot unaided rise out of the terrible paralysis of soul and go to Christian worship, however many churches and chapels there may be close at hand. They have no power of will to go; as Miss Ellice Hopkins puts it, "they are bedridden in will." And what is the use of simply asking people to go to church or chapel when they think they do not see a single intelligible earthly reason why they should. And if they go once or twice they find themselves among a number of people who have made a study of religion, and who use a language with which the neglecters of Christian worship are not at all familiar. When persons have not been to a place of worship at all,

or have not been for twenty or thirty years or more, their ideas of Christianity are confused, misty, and altogether out of joint. They want the A B C of Christianity, and not the usual stiff, formal, intellectual discourses. A simple mission service is best suited to such poor dark ignorant souls.

There is also the "clothes difficulty" to contend with. To go into a fine church or chapel without better clothing, is to the feeling of most working men about as unsuitable as putting "a pig in a parlour," to use a celebrated figure of speech which has passed into a proverb among them. The lowest of the low in the slums and alleys of the great towns and cities deeply feel this difficulty. If they be got to church or chapel once or twice, they see the great difference between their dress and the dress of the frequenters at public worship. Mostly these poor creatures have no suit of Sunday best, but only what they stand in. And there is a good deal of sensitive pride among working men; whether it is right or wrong it is there. And perhaps while human nature is what it is they will always feel keenly their coarse fustian among fine silks and rich broadcloth.

Now a simple, hearty mission service will mostly meet the case. If we had our mission rooms planted at regular distances, they would serve as splendid nursery-grounds for our churches and chapels. But these mission services must be efficiently conducted and not given into the hands of any raw recruit or vain talker, and so turned into slipshod, dull, uninteresting meetings. These services must be held on Sunday, and not left to a week-night when the men you want to get hold of are worn out with the toil of the day.

The time of service must not be too late in the evening for fear of interfering with the service in church or chapel. And really if you look at it how can the men who never go anywhere interfere with any service? You must not complain if you miss a few of your best workers from the regular Sunday-night service. If the mission work is worth doing it is worth doing well; and how is it to be done at all if you are unwilling to give up a handful of Christian workers? If paid lay agents be employed, these lay missionaries require help and encouragement from regular Christian congregations. It is folly on the part of any authorities of church or chapel to regard the mission rooms as rival places. Men ought to be thankful if any kind of agency will lay hold of the masses of the people who go to no public service. And if the preachers and people connected with churches and chapels cannot fill their respective places let them turn out and work, and the sooner the better both for preachers and people. We have a growing painful conviction that the present methods of preaching so much to Christians, of coddling and carrying them, and so keeping them spiritual babies for thirty, forty or fifty years, is not the true Christian method. Why should not Christians who have been in the way to heaven for years say to ministers, "Now do not spend so much time and strength upon us, do not visit us so much, and get up fine discourses to please our imagination and gratify our tastes; we will feed ourselves a little, and walk with our own legs; rather get out among the unconverted, and if you can find us a little of anything to do we will gladly assist you as we have opportunity." But your middle-class Christianity wants its cushioned pew, and fine

sermon, and splendid music, and gorgeous architecture, and all that pleases the senses; and leaves the masses a prey to ignorance, infidelity and the devil.

When mission services are held visitors should go round the streets asking the people to come and hear the word of life, promising to fetch the shy and timid ones, or to meet them at the mission room and find them a seat. It might be well to go in small bands of twos and threes. And if this were done with reference to the churches and chapels it would be a good thing for the church workers and for the unconverted masses of the community. The one great hindrance is Christian laziness, a selfish indulgence on the part of your middle-class Christianity which is eating all soul and life out of it. Talk of laying down our lives for our brothers, we are not willing to miss a meal for them, or a little ease, or a little amusement, or a fine sermon, or any temporary gratification. The comfortable church or chapel is attended, the poor mission room is left to one or two, or to none at all. The soft pew is preferred to the hard bench. And here probably lies the true secret of very much of the unfruitfulness of the Christianity of the present age.

When good mission services are held it is wise not to make them very long, but to hold good after-meetings. In these after-meetings you get closer to the people, and can better enter into a hand-to-hand fight with sin and the devil. When you can speak individually to the people you can get to understand their character and special difficulties better, and so you are better prepared to deal with them. For the most part we are too far off from

the people to know them, or to be of any great service to them.

Perhaps no one special agency will do always and for everybody. Different people and different localities may require different treatment. Probably methods of usefulness will get worn out by use like other things, especially by the deadening influence of habit. But we see no reason why Christians should not be as ingenious in the invention of methods of successful work, as the servants of the devil are.

The visitation of public-houses on Saturday, but somewhat early and before the men get fresh, might greatly aid a mission-room service. Publicans are often civil, and if not the work if rather sharp is also short, and your handbills and leaflets distributed you can beat a quick retreat. Why not carry the war into the very camp of the enemy? Why leave the devil to have all his own way quietly, and not rather dispute his possession of much splendid territory?

We do not much believe in free teas and in giving away money. This is an appeal to the lower nature. Real distress should be relieved, but if possible by furnishing the people with the means of independently earning their own living. We fear that bribing poor people to make them religious will never succeed in truly converting them, but in the end will make Christianity disgusting to them.

When any are won to Christ give them plenty of work to do for the Church and the world. This will fill their minds, keep them out of mischief, and deprive Satan of some of his best chances of leading them back again to their old sins and sinful pleasures. Frequently those who

are the best to get converts to Christianity are the worst to keep them when they have got them. We do not know why it should be so. We must learn better and wiser methods from the failure of the past.

Working men's Bible classes might greatly help to keep those reclaimed from a life of sin, as well as gain others over to Christianity. These might be held in cottages on Sunday afternoons or on Sunday evening, or on a week night. We do not see why there should not be efficient working men's classes associated with Sunday schools. It is so in some places. A little special arrangement might be made, as is the case for infants, and the working men might be taught separately and go into school by a separate entrance. It is worth a fair trial; but the experiment should be made by a competent person, and not too readily abandoned. A man should come to it in this spirit—"If the thing can be done at all, I will do it. I am not sure how I shall do it; I may have to change my methods, but I shall see when I get into the work, and I shall act accordingly; and I am determined never to know when I am beaten." A man of any ingenuity and resource ought to make the thing "go." There have been many splendid adult classes in Sunday schools, and some working men's classes in cottages most successfully conducted.

Let Christians do this direct home evangelisation without wearying in well-doing, and success must crown their efforts in the end. The comfortable easy-going middle-class Christianity does not sufficiently believe in the preaching of the Word, in the agency of the Holy Spirit, in prayer, and in hard church work; and so it wants fine sermons, fine churches, fine music, and an elegant church service

to get hold and to keep hold of the masses of the people. We fear this is another wolf in sheep's clothing. Is not this a new Gospel, the Gospel of æsthetics? "Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye?" Satan is not likely to be cast out of rough, hard, ignorant men and women by a superfine Gospel. "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

The Bishop of Manchester referring to ornate worship recently, asked: "Was it a good or a bad sign, was it a token of real awakening of the religious spirit, or of a barren æstheticism, a mere regard for external beauty, that caused church and chapel people in these latter days to be desirous of making God's house beautiful, and divine service attractive? More or less that desire pervaded every religious body in England. Nonconformists, who in many respects had inherited the old Puritan traditions, at one time thought nothing too plain for the chapel or meeting-house, but they had changed very much in that respect, and now their places of worship rivalled the old national churches very often in their magnitude and sometimes even in their architectural beauty and proportions. Was it the token of an awakening religious spirit, or was it a turning aside from the true path of evangelical holiness into the byways of formalism, superstition and ceremonialism? The Church of England's admirable Book of Common Prayer was their best and safest guide to keep them from the dangers of materialistic worship, of too much attention to the ceremonial, and of too meagre a form of worship for the glory of God and the edification of the people. The longer he lived and the more he saw to admire and value in the wise and moderate mind of the

Church of England. It had been tauntingly said of the Church that she kept too carefully to the middle way, and that in trying to keep the middle way she had failed to attract great masses of the people. Well, he was afraid it was too true that the great masses of the English people liked extravagances better than sobriety—extravagances in excess or extravagances in defect. There were extravagances in the way of a sensuous or superstitious ceremonial, and in the way of a bald, cold, and heartless service, and the Church Prayer Book took the middle, the sober, the wise, the moderate way between extravagances on the right hand and extravagances on the left. The English people could hardly be described as devout and reverent in their worship of Almighty God; and although they lamented and regretted the superstition and the formalism of much that was done in the great Church of Rome, any one who had travelled abroad, as he had done, in Belgian, French, or German States, must have been struck with the devout and reverent manner of the Roman Catholic people in the house of God. Going into English churches—he could only speak of the Church of England, for he was never in a Dissenting place of worship in his life—one was struck by the fact that the general aspect of the congregation during divine service was not marked by that devout absorbing spirit of reverence which would seem to say, 'There is a body of Christian people who are realising that they are in the house of God, who are feeling that they are approaching their Heavenly Father.' They were generally struck with the ladies' dresses, and it inclined one to ask why people should dress in such incongruous finery, when they had come to confess them-

selves before Almighty God 'miserable sinners.'" Bishop Fraser might have committed a greater sin than going into a Dissenting place of worship, and getting to know for himself the facts relating to the religious life and worship of the Dissenters. It appears that he has not the same conscientious scruple about going into a Roman Catholic place of worship. But this is only by the way. We fear however that the one grand remedy he sees in the Church of England Prayer Book, for keeping people from superstition on the one hand and irreligion on the other, will fail to-day as it has done in past years. Have not the Ritualists possessed the Prayer Book all through their Romeward wanderings? And has not England had the same Prayer Book all through the worst days of modern degeneracy? And we fear much of the guilt of the revival of the spirit of superstition lies at the door of the men who have been the greatest sticklers for the Prayer Book. The Bishop however with his broad and healthy nature—though not as broad and healthy as we took him to be before the above deliverance—sees that all the ornate worship in the country is not a sign of robust spiritual life; we fear it is but the ornamentation of spiritual decay.

Turn from ornate worship, which often means playing at worship, to think of the spiritual destitution in many of the great towns and cities of England. How little is done for carters, railway porters, cabmen, omnibus drivers and conductors, policemen, thieves and fallen women. So our boasted Christian civilisation in the nineteenth century appears to be a huge sham and a gigantic pretence. An omnibus conductor was asked in Manchester (1879),

"When do you start work in a morning?" "Half-past seven," was the reply. "And when do you leave off at night?" "At half-past ten or eleven," was the answer. "How much time have you for meals?" "Only what we get at the end of the journey when the 'bus stops, about ten or fifteen minutes," was again the response. "And how about Sundays?" "Well," said the man, "I have been on duty for ten Sundays running, and I did think I should get next Sunday to myself, but I have just been to the office, and have been told that I must go on duty another Sunday." Is this right or reasonable in any country, but especially in an age and nation like this? In the face of a fact like this can any one wonder at trades unions, or at the spread of Socialism, or at any kind of war with existing social arrangements and institutions? Just think of ornate worship and then ponder the above fact.

The churches do not cover the whole field of Christian toil, and so the "Salvation Army," or some such eccentric religious workers start up, and by their strange methods make Christianity ridiculous in the eyes of the thoughtful, intelligent public. This however is far more the fault of the unfaithful Churches than it is the fault of the eccentric and ignorant workers, who seeing the neglected church-work endeavour to supply the lack of service in a rough, extravagant, out-of-the-way fashion. And if things are not done "decently and in order," it is infinitely better that they should be done rudely and blunderingly than that they should never be attempted by anybody at all. When the Church of England went to sleep and neglected the masses, God raised up Methodism to do a great and glorious work for our country and for the world. And if

the Established and Nonconforming Churches become indifferent to the multitudes who neglect God's house and ordinances, then God will do His great work by the "irregulars," since the "regulars" in the properly drilled and equipped army fail in their duty.

It is only fair we should let Mr. Booth tell his own tale about his own work, and his method of procedure. At the Wesleyan Conference, London, 1880, this incident is reported to have occurred. "On the motion of Mr. T. P. Bunting, the Rev. William Booth, of the Salvation Army, was allowed to come into Conference and address it. He said, after having been welcomed by the President, that he was mixed up with a very important movement. He was a child of Wesleyan Methodism. Fifteen years ago he fell in love with the crowds of people who went to no place of worship. He was startled by a statement that 95 per cent. of the working classes did not go to any place of worship. He had always thought that if people could be got to think about religion they would adopt it; and on that line he had worked. In 1877 the army had 26 stations; in 1879, 81; and in 1880, 162. In 1877 they had 35 evangelists, while now they had 285. These evangelists are prepared to go anywhere for Christ, without any guarantee of friends or salary. In 1879 they had 1,987 unpaid speakers, while now they had 5,280. In 1880 the people had contributed £14,680 towards the work of the army. They went on lines of self-sustentation. In some matters they had improved on Methodist lines, for they satirised the penny a week and shilling a quarter. They believed when a man was converted he ought to subscribe freely towards the salvation of others. The fol-

lowing were their principles of action:—1. To go to the common people. They didn't fish in other people's waters. 2. To adapt their measures. People had a prejudice against church and chapel, but not against a theatre. 3. To set the converts to work. 4. To employ women. That might be wrong, but they had John Wesley's sanction for it. 5. Guarantee no salary. 6. Success, the condition of going on, *i.e.*, when a man failed as a worker he was stopped. 7. Believe in hard work. They had seven services every Sunday, and two every week-night. 8. They preached repentance, faith, and holiness."

This force appears to be doing a rough kind of pioneer's work, because this work is neglected by Established and Nonconformist Churches alike. But is it necessary to the success of this street mission to the neglected masses, that women should go in front of the procession walking backwards and beckoning on the people; or that men should do so too and every now and then jump as high as possible into the air? Extravagance is not goodness; eccentricity is not devotion; queerness and oddity in the streets cannot commend Christianity to sensible men. All this kind of thing is not essential to successful open-air services. People may keep their heads and yet do good even to the ignorant and degraded masses of society. We know the Church has always had a heritage of reproach from the world because of "the foolishness of preaching;" but that refers to the idea of saving people by an atonement, and not to silly preaching or silly modes of conducting religious services. We cannot expect to be free from reproach because of a Gospel which claims faith in the death of Christ as a condition of salvation. But we need not add to the reproach by

the abandonment of common-sense methods in spreading Christianity. But we can far more easily forgive eccentricity and extravagance than the cold-hearted neglect of the churches which allows people to perish without taking the Gospel to the outcasts.

Some good Christian people will do anything for poor black people, for heathens thousands of miles away whom they have never seen and never expect to see; but they will not think and act for the good of the uninstructed and degraded at their own doors. How are we to reach and stir these Christian people whose sympathy can only be touched and roused by distance? They put the wrong end of the telescope to their eye, and "distance lends enchantment to the view" of Christian work to be done for the Master. If the field of labour only be far enough, and the people black enough, some Christians will do anything for them; but home-heathenism is so very near that the work of saving their own neighbours and countrymen has no charms whatever for them. If we could cut out a section of London or Liverpool or Manchester, and contrive to drift it out to sea a few thousand miles, and then paint the people black, we should get all the money necessary to mission them.

The method of the Early Church was to begin at home, and it is still the method of the Gospel. Repentance and remission of sins were to be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Of Andrew it is said, "He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ." When the man out of whom Christ cast the unclean spirit prayed Christ that he might be with Him, it is said,

Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee." And when the Apostles of Christ went on their missionary journeys they first went into the synagogue of the Jews in any city among the Gentiles; and not till Christianity was rejected by the Jews did they turn to the Gentiles. All this is not without meaning for us to-day. It teaches us to do the work at hand. Thomas Carlyle says, "Do the work that is next thee." There is wisdom and propriety in this. It clears the way to further work, and possibly to greater work. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Put soul and earnestness into the work that is ready to thy hand, just at thy finger ends. It is the most economical work, and also the most expeditious work, as well as in harmony with the plan of Christ at the commencement of the Christian dispensation. The more you get people converted at home, the more you increase the people who pray and give and labour for the evangelisation of the heathen in the ends of the earth. You really and effectually aid the foreign work by helping the conversion of your own country.

We like home-mission organisations which say to a man put down to break up new territory, "Stay here and create a church." It is clear and definite and statesmanlike. It introduces the element of individual responsibility. It gives a certain work on certain ground. It is very much like Dr. Chalmers' territorial church scheme adopted in Scotland many years ago. The longer we live the more we dislike things with all the colour washed out of them; and the more we like clear personal responsibility. The

defect of Young Men's Christian Associations, and of town and city missions, and of undenominational Sunday schools, is that such Christian organisations work into waste. They do not work to a given place. They are all of the nature of a compromise. And all such associations have in them an element of weakness. Parties sink certain differences to accomplish a certain object. It is far better we think for all the denominations to work to their own places of worship. Then they will be able to say to people they visit, Come with us to our church or chapel, and we will see you have a seat, and a hymn-book, and are cared for in every way. This is much better than a colourless organisation which can only say, Go somewhere, but cannot invite to a particular place under the definite care and responsibility of some one individual. We believe in a farmer housing the corn he grows, and not saying to the public, Now any of you come and gather it. We believe too in the same principle all through commercial life. And we as thoroughly believe in the same principle in relation to Christian churches. Give a man a plot of ground to cultivate, and let him personally watch over people whose history he knows better than anybody else, and make him definitely responsible for that given place and work. There are many ways in which the Churches can show friendliness without spoiling spiritual work. And without some one person watching over particular cases, week after week and month after month, we fear the most difficult cases for church-workers will be completely blundered. The feature of home-mission work which gives definite responsibility and definite territory to individual men we approve and admire.

And we think this kind of work is needed especially in the great centres of population. Some feel and plead strongly for the villages. They cannot feel more than we do for villages, having lived so many years in villages and in small agricultural towns, and so knowing the need of villages. But in the great towns the better educated and the more thrifty people,—which often means the most moral,—are leaving the centre of the towns and cities and going to the suburbs. We sometimes wonder what will be the result of this if it keeps going on as it has gone on for many years past. If the most ignorant and degraded are left to themselves, those who have made money in the centre of the towns, and Christian churches generally, should see well to it that lay agents are kept at work in sufficient numbers to counteract the agents of Satan, and to prepare work properly organised for voluntary workers when free from business in the evenings. Ministers we know must and ought to be employed in such localities, but they ought to have a strong force of lay missionaries. Why cannot gentlemen who have retired from business, and gentlemen who have means without ever going into business, enter heartily into this kind of work? Why cannot ladies belonging to Nonconformist Churches enter into this kind of work as heartily and thoroughly as ladies belonging to the Church of England? Why should Miss M'Carthey's work in Chequer Alley be such a splendid exception among Wesleyans? The churches must look at this work or our country must greatly suffer.

CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS.

IT is cheaper to prevent crime than to cure it, and so the wisdom of men is to adopt a preventive policy; to establish and uphold whatever hinders evil and promotes the moral good of society. All agencies that help sobriety, industry, economy, and general virtuous living, should be encouraged and supported by all well-wishers of the public good. Christian churches ought especially to look at kinds of work that will prevent wrong-doing, as well as help wrong-doers into the paths of peace and godly living. It is matter of great encouragement that a few pens are employed in current Christian literature in the advocacy of this line of action; and we trust that writers of this character will ever increase, till the best Christian workers learn the best methods of work, and society generally reaps a large benefit. It is not enough that we attack gigantic evils in the stream, we must dry up the source; it is not enough that we deal with the terrible effects of bad conduct, we must destroy the cause; it is not enough that we prevent the consumption of injurious fruit, we must cut down and destroy the evil tree.

Look at the expensiveness of workhouses, as to buildings, the governor's salary, the wages of the servants, and the collection of the poor-rates from year to year. Look at the cost of prisons, in buildings, salaries, food and clothing,

police force, and all the essential machinery of law. Look at the cost of crime-producing institutions, public-houses, singing saloons, and all the brothels known to the police and yet allowed in the very heart of the community. Now sin is self-propagating; "a little leaven leavens the whole lump." It is so in things evil as well as good. Crime produces crime; drunkenness produces drunkenness; pauperism produces pauperism; and social statistics and family histories demonstrate that this process is repeated generation after generation. We spend large sums of money on methods which do not elevate but demoralise the people. Had we not better try some preventive measures, and see if it is not cheaper and better to make our assault on the cause of so much public demoralisation, wherever it is possible to do so with ordinary prudence?

We more and more believe in preventive measures. We waste time and energy and means by a policy of mere repression, or by simply dealing with effects without attempting to remove the cause. We ought to relieve the needy whenever it is possible by finding them the means of earning their own living, if they be able to work. This is the most effectual relief. Relief that only meets hunger is not so good as relief that goes to the cause of distress and removes the cause. So we might say with regard to relief for poor street arabs. It is better to put them into some institution and teach them a trade, than to give them free breakfasts, free dinners and free suppers. So again with our prisons and workhouses and reformatory schools; we would make them all as nearly as possible self-supporting, and not burden the poor honest ratepayers to

support criminals, and idlers, and improvident people. And as to public subscriptions for relief in commercial depression, it is better to employ the people on some public works than to dole out promiscuous charity.

The wealth and the pauperism of England are both wonderful. Put the growing wealth and the growing pauperism side by side, and you will be completely startled and perplexed. "About one out of every ten of our entire population, or one-fifth of the industrial classes of our country, become during the year chargeable to the community as paupers." We have also about 140,000 criminals constantly in our prisons; 54,000 or 55,000 known thieves; 250,000 vagrants; 600,000 habitual drunkards; necessitating the employment of some 20,000 or 25,000 policemen. All this shows the need of church-work; and for the highest possible efficiency on the part of the Church it is necessary to conserve her force and economise her resources. If we waste we so far become incapable, as churches, of doing our proper and full work; souls are left to perish, and the glory of the Lord and Head of the Church is proportionately diminished. We must therefore steward all our means wisely and well to enable us most to glorify God and to benefit our fellow-men.

Christian people ought to be more thoughtful, observant, and careful as to their methods of putting and keeping society right than other people are; and yet how little some of them think and read and observe in order to fit themselves for living usefully and wisely. As Christianity is capable of being worked scientifically, on all social questions, why not proceed on the inductive method, and

by careful experiment and observation endeavour to reach right conclusions? Things are often made worse instead of better by thoughtless haste. The remedy is worse than the disease. Evil is often driven out of one form into another by hasty and ill-considered measures; as for instance the Contagious Diseases Acts are likely to drive immorality deeper into families, while making criminal intercourse safe. Let changes be slowly and safely effected, not violently and without due consideration. People are mostly in too great haste, impatient, and of limited range of observation, and so, like children, they want everything done in a hurry. They say to themselves. Things are sadly out of joint, and really something must be done to improve matters, as they cannot possibly go on any longer in their present awful state. Such people are far more concerned about doing something than about doing the right thing. God is never in a great hurry. He proceeds slowly but surely in nature, in providence, and in the great work of redemption. This is a great rebuke to human impatience and thoughtlessness. And really it is far more important that we do things safely and wisely than that we make great haste and adopt wrong methods. We may easily undo the good that has already been done; or we may put back a good cause for generations. To get on the right path, to secure the right method, and to work in the right direction is half the battle in every good cause. Guilty, thoughtless, unpardonable blundering has worked great mischief to society in the past. Are we likely to do better in the present and in the future? We think we discover more hopeful signs in periodical literature and in books on church-work. To this change in methods of

work philanthropists and Christians are not a little indebted to scientists and to sceptical opponents.

When we look at Christian haste without corresponding Christian thought and wisdom, we are reminded of people greatly alarmed and losing their heads in some terrible catastrophe. They are not aware exactly what they ought to do, or perhaps what they actually are doing. Christians should not allow themselves to get into an excited state like that; but they should plan coolly and wisely the whole of their philanthropic enterprise and church-work. The danger is of putting new cloth on the old garment and so making the rent worse. The old forms and methods must be preserved till the new spirit and methods are quite ready. But the new wine must not be put into old bottles. When the occasion has fairly come, alas for us if we refuse to march with the times. It is so whether we look at social or spiritual affairs, and even at all political movements for the good of the people. When society is ripe for an advance we must move on in some new direction; but we must take care that we march on the right lines. Better stand still, if at all doubtful, till we have ascertained that we are really in the right path.

Look at the great waste of Christian money in the present methods of conducting many charitable institutions and church organisations. What large sums of money are positively wasted in connection with anniversary sermons. A man is sent for to preach from a distance of a hundred or two hundred miles, and large placards are posted all over a town or village. The mode of conducting Christian and philanthropic business is a splendid thing for printers and railway shareholders, but a sorry thing for the good

cause interested. And yet there are thousands of good benevolent people who will not contribute toward an institution, however much needed and praiseworthy it may be, unless "a great man" comes to preach once a year; and a crowd of people forsake their own church or chapel to attend the anniversary sermons, though they would not go to hear the same "great man" on an ordinary occasion. If they would learn to give on principle they might greatly economise, and keep charitable institutions out of debt. They might also keep from interfering with the regular working of the churches; for emptying some to fill others is not to do good but harm. And they would then probably be in a state of mind calm and reasonable enough to see how much a head many noble institutions cost, not excepting Sunday schools. The fact is some pet Sunday schools spend nearly as many pounds a year as they have scholars. What would be the relative difference between the expense of some Sabbath schools and the bulk of ordinary day schools, if the difference in the amount of teaching were fairly allowed for? We do not say this in any ungenerous or captious spirit, but because we fear the waste in one department of Christian service tends to starve some other equally good and important department. It is for reasonable Christian people to look into these matters; and to see to it that they work God's business even more carefully and efficiently than they work their own. Surely God claims that we act with good judgment, and that we keep all parts of His work prudently attended to. Some good Christian people think little; and give and spend money in all charitable affairs whimsically. In domestic affairs and in business affairs they act with good sense; but

their good sense forsakes them when they have to deal with the broad interests of humanity. Beside, they make special pets, and so they are willing to do anything for some one thing, but nothing for anything else. "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone."

But in relation to Sunday schools we have to face a much more serious question than the waste of money, we mean the waste of the precious opportunity of leading the young to Christ. Some Sunday-school teachers read foolish tales to their classes instead of giving the children Christian instruction, and trying in every possible way to get the children committed to their care converted to Christ. Some again do not prepare proper lessons for their classes, and let the children read wherever they choose, without ever attempting any explanation or application of Divine truth. Is it any wonder that the results of Sabbath-school teaching in such instances are so sad to contemplate? We say this not in anger but in love. We have reason for saying it. It was found in Derby at a midnight meeting held for the recovery of fallen women, that out of seventy-two, seventy had passed through Sunday schools. At four such meetings held in Manchester in the summer of 1879, we found that nearly all the poor creatures could sing our popular hymns as familiarly and as well as they are sung in our Sunday schools. Even where the bulk of the population passes through our Sabbath schools we do not get the masses of the people to Christian worship. This tells its own tale.

Look at the same sad waste of means and effort through bad judgment or bad feeling, or both, in many towns and villages of our country where there are more

institutions of one kind or other than are needed. Sometimes there are more churches and chapels in a small village or a small town than are required by the population of the place. Perhaps you find a Congregational chapel, a Baptist chapel, a Wesleyan chapel, a New Connexion chapel, a Free Methodist chapel, and a Primitive Methodist chapel where one good chapel would have held the whole people. One preacher would have done for the whole. Think of the expense of building, of repairs, of cleaning and painting, and of other incidental expenses; think of chapel keeper's salary, and the employment of six chapel keepers where one would have done. Think, too, of the employment of six preachers when one could have easily preached to the whole people. And probably these six chapels have six Sunday schools attached. One good school would have done for the whole children, and one set of teachers would have taught them. We have met with some astonishing instances of this terrible waste in some parts of our country. There may be some reasonable apology made in some instances on the score of the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience. But where parties hold the same essential doctrines and are practically at one in church polity, as is the case with the different Methodist Churches, there does seem to be no justification of this great and terrible waste. Whatever may have been the case in the history of the past in the judgment of different parties, the reasons of the past are not the reasons of the present. If the Methodist families were to unite in the face of the growing Ritualism and Romanism of England, what a grand thing for our country. The same might be said

of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. Look at the immense saving in the two countries for Christian purposes if the unions referred to were effected. We are quite aware that we have only referred to the argument of economy, and we know that there are many other sides to be considered; but the one point of saving in means and effort is a very grave one, especially when we consider that what the Church wastes in one direction it needs in another. Many villages are neglected, and the slums in great towns, while the Church wastes her means and efforts in other places.

Look again at the waste of time and energy at public meetings by engaging too many speakers, or by foolishly requiring all the preachers or church-workers to be present, when there is not work for all to do. We do not speak of those occasions when it is supposed that these parties attend for personal profit of an intellectual or spiritual kind. We refer to ordinary occasions when it is simply because people like to see all the force present, and for no other earthly or heavenly reason. In other spheres of life and labour the people would not tolerate the same waste. A farmer would not send four horses to any part of his farm to work when there was only work for two horses. A joiner or builder would not send six men to a building when only three were required. Why then waste time and strength and means in higher work, when you would scorn to do it in a lower sphere? Most public men have had days and weeks and months of a very short and uncertain life positively wasted, simply to be looked at on a platform, or in a committee room, or in some equally foolish way. Christ

said, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost." Many good people say, Never mind the loss.

What waste of means, time and strength we see in the contention of the churches for ritual, dogma and the non-essentials of Christianity! We believe in dogmatic theology of a Scriptural character; but how many dogmas men have added of their own making! How many again are zealous for modes and forms of Christian worship, while omitting the weightier matters of Christian doctrine and practice. And how many are daily substituting their own opinions and speculations for vital godliness. The theories and traditions of men make void the law of God, and all the while these very men dream that they are doing God service. It is infinitely pitiful to see Christian men "playing" at worship and making a "show" of religion, while multitudes are perishing around them. And perhaps even more pitiful to see Christians, who call themselves broad and comprehensive in their theological views and teachings, doing absolutely nothing but philosophise away their time leaving the masses to perish with the mere husks of Christianity, when the people ask for true bread to satisfy their hunger. And these various church parties are contending for supremacy—not Christ's supremacy but their own, and leaving the multitude in ignorance and degradation. They are fighting one another instead of fighting sin and the devil. As the story goes, Napoleon heard that two of his officers were fighting a duel. He went to them, and putting his sword between the officers said, "Gentlemen, you mistake the enemy." And pointing to the opposing army that lay encamped in the distance he said, "The enemy is yonder." It is right and needful to

contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; but the churches have too commonly fought for an idea, or fought for the first place, or fought for a "scientific frontier" which they did not know what to do with when they had got, and so fought again to get rid of a supposed advantage which was found to be no advantage at all, but a disadvantage. Protestants and Roman Catholics, Churchmen and Dissenters, Jews and Gentiles, and all the intermediate varieties of opinion and belief have from time to time engaged in deadly controversial warfare with one another, and left Satan to take his own way in perfect ease, as the churches themselves were neglecting Christ's work and doing Satan's. Now this is a waste of vital force. In political economy this waste is condemned; and we hold it to be equally and even more condemned in Christianity. "Labour is human life-force expended in order to get the means of livelihood." The formula which clearly and fully expresses the great principle of political economy respecting production and consumption is stated thus: "With the least expenditure of life (whether in actual or previous labour in the form of accumulated capital) produce the greatest possible amount of commodities which are the sustenance of life; and with the least waste of acquired means for sustaining life procure the highest possible development in the personal life by consumption." When will the Church of Christ learn "with the least expenditure of life to acquire the greatest possible amount of life, or vital existence?" It is startling to think of the great valley to be filled up between our thought and care in ordinary human affairs, and our want of thought and care in important Christian affairs.

Think of the waste in building expensive places of worship! Gothic chapels may be beautiful to look at, but they cost too much. Not only do they fail of their purpose, but they exhaust the means of the people. For teaching they are extremely unsuitable, as the congregation cannot hear the preacher. They defeat the end for which they are erected. They do well enough for Ritualism and Romanism, for the procession of the cross and for singing, but not for the preaching of the Gospel. The Protestant Church is essentially a teaching Church, and when we sacrifice preaching to music and sensuous display we shall make the work of Rome infinitely easier of accomplishment. Modified Gothic without an open roof is not so objectionable; but it may be made too costly. When we see a splendid Gothic chapel with a noble spire, we see in the spire a mission room and a lay missionary. If people will build expensive places of worship to gratify their tastes, let them build mission rooms too in order to get at the masses of the people. If both cannot be built let chapels be less expensive and let the people be reached by means of mission rooms and lay missionaries. In this way places and workers for all classes of the community may be found, as they assuredly ought to be. What Christian right have wealthy people to provide themselves with expensive churches and chapels, while the poor and the outcasts are neglected? The new cathedral in Cornwall, to be built at a cost of between one and two hundred thousand pounds, is an unnecessary expenditure and a positive waste. It is not needed, and with the money several churches might have been built in neglected and evil neighbourhoods. And much the same thing might be

said of some Nonconformist chapels. To pay from eighteen to twenty-four thousand pounds for a comparatively small chapel is hardly the right thing to do, when the masses of the people are left in ignorance and ungodliness for want of suitable places and agents to reach them. Men in their own business would study adaptation to the people, and in their calculations consider the necessities of the whole population. Let them do it in God's business, and then His work will stand a chance of being done as well as their own.

We ought to do Christian and philanthropic work on the most economical principles. We ought so to work as not to stand in the way of the working of other people as to schools, places of worship, or benevolent societies of any kind; because all that we waste is needed somewhere. We should seek out needy localities, and needy objects, and be willing to take up unpopular and neglected work. With so much work to be done, and especially in some places, it is a sin and a shame to waste or to hinder the working of the true-hearted and sincere who are it may be more qualified by gifts and graces than we are. When benevolent workers get too thick upon the ground, the result almost invariably is the degradation of the people they wish to benefit. In this way: no party wants to be beaten or to be behind other parties of workers, so they buy the people for party triumphs. It may be that they are bought by blankets, or teas, or trips, or by sums of money; but it all means the same thing,—the corruption and bribery of the people. Or else Christian workers tread upon the heels of each other in certain populous portions of towns, while neglecting others, as actually was the case

in Charter-street, Manchester, where a poor woman once said, "Nay, I have had four of you already this morning; I can't have any more."

Think of the fearful waste incurred by building churches and chapels deeply in debt; and in pursuing the same policy in many other Christian and philanthropic matters. We strongly doubt the morality of debt on God's cause. To say nothing of the evil influence church debt has on Christian people, suggesting the idea of meeting difficulties by incurring debt, and encouraging the thing by church example and practice,—churches and chapels are paid for over and over again in some instances by the payment of interest of money. A minister once declared with reference to certain chapels erected without judgment, "It would have been a grand piece of Christian economy, if the man who built those chapels had put the hundreds of pounds he paid into the sea instead of touching bricks and mortar." So it might be said in regard to many a Christian and philanthropic organisation. The thing is killed in the beginning by a heavy debt. People who have to work the organisation are all put out of heart. And when you see a promising infant cause strangled in this way you see the truth of the lines,

> "Evil is wrought for want of thought,
> As well as want of heart."

Are the time and strength of Christian ministers most economically applied in the production and delivery of fine intellectual discourses? Congregations ask for an intellectual Christianity, that is, in an age of luxuries they ask that religion may be turned into a luxury too. Beside, on the part of the minister does not personal credit or the

love of fame spoil his work in complying with the demand for this Christian luxury? Does it not lead the preacher to preach for "the salvation of sermons," instead of preaching for the salvation of sinners? In preparing these discourses the minister is occupied morning, noon and night, and cannot find time for visiting and other necessary church-work. He is in fact a mental slave to supply not a necessity but a luxury; a mental slave grinding out so many sermons per week, according to order. And in many of these fashionable audiences the splendid sermon is only "a sensation lasting for thirty or forty minutes," as it is put by the late F. W. Robertson, of Brighton. If we had our way the churches should have fewer sermons till they could tell more about the sermons they hear. Members who complained of this should be put through an examination to see how much they digested of the teaching they got, and what use they made of it. The minister should be left free to preach more to individuals in the street and in the houses of the people. If he refused to do this he should be put back to the old slavery of producing a given number of sermons per week again. Is it not a melancholy fact that there is too much preaching in the pulpit and too little preaching out of it? We have carried "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" into the captivity of our churches and chapels, and the sooner we deliver it out of this miserable bondage the better for ministers and people. We do not plead for less preaching taken as a whole; but for less in one place and more in another. We do not plead for feeble minds in the pulpit but for the strongest; yet we claim that these most select heads shall have more of business purpose in them than of fine intellectual

display. The times call for the use and not for the waste of mental power.

There is much non-productive labour in ordinary life, and how much non-productive labour in the Church? Political economists generally divide labour into two classes, that is, productive and non-productive. Productive labour is labour which increases the value of a thing, and so adds to the sum total of our wealth. Such is the labour of the farmer, the builder, and of operatives generally. Non-productive labour is labour which is not directly engaged in the production of material wealth. Such is the labour of soldiers, policemen, schoolmasters, physicians and ministers of the Gospel. But Political Economy as usually stated does not cover the whole ground. There are some producers of labour who destroy as much or even more than they produce. If a man does thirty shillings' worth of work in a week and spends forty shillings, the community really loses ten shillings per week by that man; and he does not create but destroys national wealth. Now it is after this fashion with some Christian workers; they do and undo, stand in the way of better workers, and hinder instead of advancing the cause of God. They are people perhaps with many excellences, but also with manifold serious defects. They work by fits and starts, lack steadiness, and do not persevere. They work for a few months or a few years as if they would soon convert the world, and then completely collapse, and do nothing or next to nothing for months or years. Or they retain a position in the church for which they have grown unfit; or they want to do all the work themselves and get all the credit; or they have grown more important than the work of God, and if they

cannot be what is sometimes called "first horse" then nobody else shall be as long as they can help it; or their particular department in church-work is in their estimation by far the most important, and so all else must give way to it; or their chapel is the most important in the circuit, or their church the most important in the district, and so all the others must give way for this particular one which must have the best preaching, the best of everything, and all the others must starve to feed and pamper this one wonderful and exceptional cause. Or a man works imprudently, works against the laws of nature, and it may be does six months' work in three and then knocks up for a year or two. All these instances show that very grave and serious deductions have to be made from the work of some workers in the cause of God. They work well it may be, but they also greatly waste.

We are not prepared to admit that schoolmasters, physicians, and Christian ministers are non-producers of labour, excepting in the narrow sense of Political Economy. But even in the teaching of political economy ought they not to be regarded as amongst the very highest and best producers of labour? In this way: the physician repairs the physical constitution. He really repairs the working machine, which is human, just as the engineer repairs the iron machine, which is not human. But the physician works as truly in a productive sense as the engineer does. So of the schoolmaster. He works upon the human worker, and fits him as a superior instrument to do material work. What is all the machinery in the world without the intelligent worker? There must be a skilled operator or machinery is useless. So that the schoolmaster

producing intelligent workers is really a most important factor in Political Economy rightly understood. We may say the same of the Christian minister. A minister of religion so far from being a non-producer of labour is really one of the highest possible producers of labour. For instance, if he establishes a young men's improvement class, as is the case with many ministers, and by gathering young men about him creates a spirit of inquiry and thoughtfulness, and leads forty or fifty young men to read, observe and improve themselves generally,—does he not by improving the workers improve the work? If again by his preaching he imparts comfort to workers in their sorrow, and strengthens them so that they bear up in perplexity and misfortune, and communicates Christian instruction in such a way as to keep the workers sober and thoughtful and moral, is he not greatly aiding the productive labour of the community? If further he writes a book and quickens thought and intelligence, and upholds the morality of society, is he not thereby assisting the production of material wealth by aiding the intelligence and character of the workers, and by helping the formation of habits which will prevent waste? If Political Economy were not narrow it would admit these so-called indirect workers as among the greatest aids in the creation of material prosperity.

We cannot say the same for soldiers and policemen. They have undoubtedly a value in society in so far as they render the rights and the property of men more secure. But should we not adopt a policy directed to the cure of social evils and disorders, a policy therefore removing social evils and disorders, and taking away the need of soldiers and policemen to a larger and larger extent? Is

it not better to secure a moral protective force than to trust to a merely physical force protection? The need of a merely protective force may be marvellously diminished by moral means. How quiet great towns are after eleven o'clock at night compared with their drunken and disturbed condition before the early closing of public-houses! It was all effected most peacefully. And even ministers going home from some public meeting, or from some preaching appointment in the country, became suspicious characters and were sharply looked after by the police.

We must seek to do useful work in the Church and in the community. We must do it by applying economical principles to Christian work, so as to make it in the highest degree productive labour. It is all the more necessary to do this because of the great waste so commonly occasioned by doing and undoing what we have already done, or else by undoing what somebody else has done; and also occasioned by injudicious modes of working. We have often acted like a man who employs a dozen men to build a wall five days of the week, and on the sixth tells them to pull it down. To say nothing of the unemployed talent, the undeveloped power running to waste in the churches, there is the misdirected energy and resources of the churches, as bad in a Christian sense as building up a wall merely to pull it down again is in a commercial sense.

The land in England is capable of far greater productiveness than at present we witness; and it is precisely so with reference to the moral soil. We need only refer to Pentecost, early Methodism, the Sankey and Moody movement some years ago, and occasional local revivals of religion; all showing what might be accomplished by the

Church of Jesus if Christians were only alive to their duty and responsibility, and working on the right methods with proper perseverance. The waste in land is only equalled by the waste of the Church and the moral wastes of our country. Mr. W. Hoyle says, in *Our National Resources; and How they are Wasted*, "That considerably above one-third of the land in the United Kingdom is still wholly uncultivated." He says again, "The agricultural interest has nowhere kept pace with the other, and in many districts has scarcely made any progress at all." Mr. Mechi says, "I have tested this by comparative results, and find that, if all the land of this kingdom, 50,000,000 acres, which is equal in quality with my own, produced as much as mine does per acre, our agricultural produce would be increased by the enormous amount of £421,000,000 annually, the present produce, according to my calculation, being only £3 7s. per acre, or £169,000,000. According to my annual produce of £11 15s. per acre, it would be £687,000,000. This is no exaggeration, but a stern and humiliating fact."

One point to be looked at is,—we waste the sewage; it pollutes our rivers and breeds disease, when it might be turned into food for the hungry soil and enrich the land. Properly there is no waste in nature. When food has served its purpose in the animal economy it is meant to fructify the earth. If this were wisely attended to, it is stated on the best authority, that there is a possibility of more than doubling the present produce of land in England.

This great national waste finds its counterpart in the way the Church acts in the cultivation of the moral soil. So much of it is not cultivated at all. So much of it is

very imperfectly cultivated. And so much of it is impoverished by wasted means when it might be rendered fruitful by the appliances God has placed at our disposal. If we cultivated the moral soil properly; if we availed ourselves of all opportunities of doing good by speaking to people about their personal salvation, by putting Christian literature into their hands, and by praying for their conversion while we try to get Divine truth into the mind; if we did not so persistently keep Christianity shut up in great walls,—just as some gentlemen build great walls round their gardens, and so keep all the beauty from the poor people and the public generally; if we let the multitude see "the beauty of holiness" by taking the Gospel into the streets, and so impress them with our love to them and with our earnest wish to save them; if we found employment for new converts and kept old converts at work, and left no means untried in order to seek and to save "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," the influence of the Church upon the world would be marvellously different from what it is. God has given us the means of spiritual fruitfulness, and did we use them splendid crops would be reaped on every hand, but by waste and the improper use of such means we pollute the channels of communication, spread spiritual disease, and impoverish the soil of the Church.

The law of "supply and demand," which regulates commercial life, cannot altogether regulate Church life. The populations most needing Christianity are precisely the populations least disposed toward it, and not asking for it or seeking it, but in heart and life opposed to it. So that the Church has to take the Gospel to an unwilling

and disobedient people, who wish to be let alone, to be undisturbed in their wickedness, and left without God and without hope in the world. Christianity is needed but not "demanded," and so the Church must "supply" the Gospel without the "demand," because Christ has commanded the Church to preach the Gospel to every creature. We must not lose sight of this fact in our concern for Christian economics. There is a great amount of Christian work which we must do, which we cannot reasonably expect to pay financially for years; yet it is at our peril and at the peril of society generally for us to neglect it. But it is prudent to put this upon the most economical basis possible, and to make it remunerative as soon, and as far as we can, for the sake of other equally needy work.

If for example we consider home-mission work in the poorest and most evil neighbourhoods, we cannot expect it to pay financially. Were we to plant churches and chapels in respectable artisan populations, this might supply moderate financial returns; and ultimately a good working men's church might be established which would be self-sustaining or nearly so. But it is altogether different with regard to the lowest populations in the most degraded districts of our great towns and cities. This kind of work does not make direct money returns; it looks like working Christianity at a loss financially; perhaps it is so in the narrow commercial sense. Yet this is work that must be done by the churches, because the poorest and the worst are redeemed and immortal. However, we think that even here it would be a fatal mistake not to teach the very outcasts to give as God enables them when converted, toward the carrying on of His cause. So far as we can

ascertain, those mission rooms do best and get on most which help themselves, and do not unnecessarily lean upon others for aid.

The Church must undertake aggressive work because the world by the Church is to be converted to Christ; yet in Christian aggression Christians must not lose their heads, waste their means, and cripple themselves for years or for generations. A mother church has sometimes given birth to a fine daughter, without being able to nurse that daughter properly. Sometimes a mother church has had many daughters, and not been able to take care of them. We have known instances in which splendid circuit schemes have been formed, by which all the schools and chapels in the circuit were to be benefited; and they have been splendid failures. The schemes were wild, and there was a scramble for the good things by all the parties concerned, without proper care being taken to replenish the funds. And when at length the schemes were completed the circuit was in greater financial difficulty than before, because the policy adopted was not financially remunerative nor ever likely to be. Too many small chapels were built without strong mother chapels to nurse them, or without a minister to watch over them. The money spent to relieve the circuits brought the circuits into greater embarrassment than ever, and plainly indicated the want of a business-like policy which would have left the circuits with an income to go on with, and free to attend to spiritual work without perpetual financial perplexity. We have known instances too in which the rage for chapel building has completely carried people off their feet, debt has accumulated, and by-and-by circuits have proposed to give up

two ministers out of four because they could not pay their way, as the interest of money to be paid swallowed up the whole resources of the people. Just as many a splendid business has been completely ruined by sheer mismanagement, so it has been with many an individual church that had apparently a glorious future before it. Many a general has wasted an army for want of proper plans, and many an army has been sacrificed through incompetent officers. The same thing is seen in the Church. It is necessary therefore in attacking the strongholds of evil that we should look well to our plans, while we trust in the living God and pray for the help of the Holy Spirit. By financial blundering we impede spiritual work and postpone the universal reign of Christ.

Mission work abroad has paid us as a people, and so will home evangelisation. The converted heathen have purchased our goods, and sent their produce to our markets. Every penny that England has spent on the evangelisation of the nations has been paid back again a thousandfold. And a maritime nation like ours, doing business with India, China, Africa, and in fact with every part of the world, has nothing to lose but much to gain by missionary enterprise. Rightly understood it is the cause of the manufacturer, the agriculturist, and the artisan. Missions open markets for skilled labour, for our calicoes, and for farmers whose sons often emigrate to some promising field like New Zealand or Canada. Looked at in the simple light of Political Economy the work of Christian missions has been a marvellous blessing to our country.

And if the Church will only as heartily enter into the work of home missions we promise results as great and as

blessed. If we could only make the slums and alleys of our big towns morally and physically clean; if we could only make men and women sober and thoughtful, thrifty and industrious; if we could only teach them to ventilate their houses and to remove the filth from the premises; and if we could only lead them to form Christian ideas and habits, we might save millions of money to the community and millions of valuable lives to the families. If again we could evangelise the villages and the small provincial towns, what a gain it would be in health and money and morals. The villages and small towns of our country are not as pure and simple in habits and morals as is sometimes supposed and taken for granted. We are taking the lowest ground here, and are merely dealing with Christian economics; but the spiritual aspects of the subject far exceed all possible calculation as to value. The salvation of the soul is beyond all price; we have no standard by which to judge its value. But when we look at the work of Christian Sociology, materially and spiritually, we see that the argument for home and foreign missions is perfectly irresistible; and society constructed on natural principles is not the safest or the most advantageous.

People must give wisely and liberally as well as pray and work for the conversion and social elevation of the multitude. Men say, "But we have to provide for our children." Is it however really necessary that Christian men should accumulate immense fortunes for their offspring? It is hard to say whether children are not cursed by large fortunes rather than blest by them. Should not godly men especially consider this matter? A good education and the formation of good habits are worth more than money.

John Wesley did not accumulate money, though he might have done so by the sale of his books. He died a poor man, and did almost as much work for the masses as any dozen ordinary men. The conversion of a man is a very poor thing indeed if the Gospel does not convert his purse too. It is a burning shame that the Church to-day has to have recourse to all kinds of doubtful measures to raise ways and means to carry on any benevolent enterprise. The holding of so many bazaars is enough to make men think that Christianity is on its last legs, when money cannot be got otherwise for the work of God. It is doubtful if any one man ought to possess millions of money; because it is doubtful if such a man has done his duty in giving to the cause of God and for the material welfare of his fellow-men. We know very few if any Christians who are made better by great wealth. We know some who we greatly fear are made worse by it. They were apparently better and more zealous Christians when they were much poorer. We would not judge harshly; yet the rule is, "by their fruits ye shall know them." Some Christians say, "But we are always giving, and still the good cause is, always in debt." It is not true that Christians are always giving; we wish it were, because they are always receiving: and is not all property God's? Beside, we very strongly doubt the morality of churches going into debt, though not incurred without a probability of paying. Is not the effect on society generally very injurious? For people generally, probability receives a large interpretation, and mostly means that they hope to be able to pay some time. Perhaps men may not have the opportunity of making as large fortunes in the future as

men have had in the past; but be that as it may Christian churches and Christian organisations ought not to be in debt while Christian people have money in abundance. The style of giving is not what it ought to be. Sin is far more expensive than righteousness. Is it reasonable that Christians should give less to Christ's cause than they used to do to the devil's?

What waste there is at marriages and funerals and in a lavish style of living generally in these days! And Christians appear to be as guilty, if not more guilty than other people,—because Christians profess to be crucified with Christ, and so to be dead to the world. The customs at marriages and funerals are most irrational. Money is often wasted then which is sorely needed afterwards. Well-to-do people should set the example, as the poor feel helpless here, looking at it as a kind of social disgrace not to do as other people do. Many a poor widow has spent nearly all the club-money, or the few pounds that were saved by hard economy, in giving her husband what was considered decent burial, when the family sorely needed the money. Hatbands and gloves taken in such cases cannot but bring strange thoughts to Christian minds. And at marriages there is often a lavish expenditure that cannot be justified on any ground but custom, and then sometimes there is a great struggle to pay the bills. People say all this is good for trade. Is it good for trade that persons should so spend money that they cannot afterwards pay their way? We do not dream of bringing all down to one level of expenditure; but how in the name of common sense can we give to the Church and for the good of the community if we waste the means we possess?

Now as all states of society are subject to economic laws we must not look upon charitable institutions and church organisations as exempt from such laws, simply because these organisations and institutions are not worked by private capital but by the free gifts of the people. Should we not as carefully economise voluntary labour and voluntary contributions, as we economise private capital and private enterprise? Christian and philanthropic workers are subject to economic laws, and above all men they must not dare to waste what is sacred and specially belongs to God, either the money, or the strength, or the time, or the ability of the Church, or of any organisation affording assistance to the Church in her great mission to convert the world. And the sooner we all recognise and pay proper regard to economic laws in all we do for God and man, the wiser and better for us and for others.

CHAPTER III.

SPIRITUAL LESSONS.

LOOKING at this subject in its religious relations its highest momentousness is clearly seen. Mere outward morality, and the kindlier feelings and sentiments of our nature, ought never to be lost sight of in the contemplation of a topic like this. But these points, though important, are the lowest views that can be taken of the matter, and sink into comparative insignificance when compared with the higher and more enduring concerns of spiritual religion. We ought not to sink the human in the Divine, the natural in the spiritual. God has created the body, and so cares for it; we ought therefore to care for it too. But on the other hand we ought not to lose the spiritual in the natural. The soul is of infinitely higher moment than all merely human interests. And, consequently, when we look at beings of one common origin and end we ask ourselves, Is there not in all this a motive to enlist our sympathies and to engage our efforts for the spiritual elevation of those who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh? As we are our brother's keeper, in this deep religious sense, ought we not to do something beyond sympathising with his worldly position or social circumstances? Are we not bound by virtue of our relationship to endeavour to fit him for life's highest duties and heaven's immortality? Undoubtedly on the

ground of kindredship he has claims upon us which we can never throw off, though we never attempt to answer them, but systematically ignore or in positive language deny them; and God has made those claims spiritual and eternal as well as human and temporal.

Then, too, as we have already, seen man has influence in the brotherhood, and for the right exercise of that influence God holds him responsible. If he prove a stumbling-block to his brothers, their guilt will lie at his door, their blood will be found in the skirts of his garments; and the voice of the blood of murdered souls will cry to God for vengeance, and cry to heaven from the ground whereon the spiritual crime was committed as certainly and effectually as the blood of righteous Abel testified against Cain. And as certainly as Cain was visited with punishment for his atrocious crime, so certainly will all else be visited with punishment for spiritually murdering their brethren, unless their sin be repented of and forgiven. The law of Christianity is this: "To him that hath shall be given." He who uses what God gives, according to the purpose and intention of the Giver, shall have more. But he who does not employ God's gifts aright, that is, in the way God directed and intended that he should, "from him shall be taken away even that he hath;" and he will be visited with overwhelming and irretrievable punishment. "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxv. 30).

We think it likewise follows from this relationship, and the responsibility growing out of it, that man is under obligation zealously to seek the spiritual good of his

brethren. We mean that it is not enough that he studiously and from principle avoids every cause of stumbling to his brother. That is simply a neutral relation, a cold, negative thing, and will not justify us at last before God. The language of the stern man of the desert is clear and strong: "Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." So it is not enough that we take care to do our brother no harm; we must earnestly strive to do him good. Human brotherhood, properly understood, implies vastly more than abstaining from whatever would injure our brother, and then coldly and indifferently looking on, watching the movements of others in the world's spiritual conflicts, but all the while remaining inactive ourselves. If we impartially examine the principle of such procedure, is it not a foul blot, an everlasting disgrace on humanity thus to conduct ourselves toward our fellows? What, for example, would be our impressions with reference to any man in whose charge a younger brother had been left by the will of the father, if the man never exerted himself for that brother's welfare? If he neglected to educate, to apprentice to some suitable business, and to attend to the general interests of that younger member of his family,—should we not regard him as perfectly inhuman, beneath a man and a brother, dead to all brotherly feelings and considerations? Nevertheless, though God has made us our brother's keeper and plainly told us so, we neglect him, disown him, and trample upon his moral and spiritual claims, practically ignoring the relationship subsisting between us. God has made it our duty to love our brother, and to help him in every possible way; but we have too commonly turned round upon man,

and in the very face of God contemptuously asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" And then we have proudly and inhumanly acted the part of another Cain toward another Abel. It only shows how far fallen human nature is, and how callous it is possible for human hearts to become; and that Christian men may be so dead to the finer moral feelings as to slay by cold neglect their own brethren.

But we commonly make some allowance for those who make no great profession of religion. We do not generally expect the same regard for Christian principle and practice from members of formal churches that we do from those who belong to acknowledged aggressive and zealous churches. And yet what is the fact of the case in relation to the best of us? Do we look upon man wherever and however we find him, irrespective of character and condition, as a true undoubted brother? Is our conduct toward him invariably of a brotherly character? We fear for the most part it is far otherwise. Comparatively speaking for him we forego little pleasure and deny ourselves of little ease, enduring at the utmost small inconvenience for his sake. Our conduct seldom if ever reaches the standard of self-sacrifice. How very few there are in the churches who fully act out the parable of the Good Samaritan in its broadest and deepest principles. When we come to the place where our brother is lying in his degradation and helplessness, like the Levite we pass by on the other side and allow mere looking on to suffice; and in some instances we dare not even look at him for fear our better feelings should prompt us to assist him. Or, as Miss Hopkins puts it, in *Work Among Working Men*, "The good Samaritan has no need to get off his beast nowadays, and go to

the wounded man 'where he is;' least of all to go to the sensational length of giving up his own beast to him, and himself trudging laboriously on foot; he contents himself with the reflection that the inn is close by where he can get attended to, and it is his own fault if he doesn't go to it. He needn't trouble himself any longer with the question whether, as he is half dead, he isn't too far gone to care, or to get there, if he did care; but rides on, with the comfortable reflection that so much is being done for people of his class. Only in this version of the parable, one cannot help asking whether the Samaritan has not reverted to the older and commoner type of his race, those 'who feared the Lord, *and* served their own idols.'" The very people who ought to do most, often do the least for God and for the helpless, neglected, uninstructed, degraded multitudes. They make loud professions and like to have the respectability of belonging to a popular church, but they content themselves with the credit of church association without church-work.

It is a humiliating fact, but a fact nevertheless, that we who ought to have been in the thick of the fight, in the foremost ranks of the battle, have with cowardly hearts either loitered in the rear or else have never gone forth with the army of the Church at all. May the merciful God forgive His servants in this matter and help us to do better for the future; so influence our thinking and operate on our hearts, that we shall henceforth do with our might whatsoever our hand finds to do for His glory and the spiritual good of society; remembering if we refuse to work heartily and earnestly for Him now, it will be impossible to accomplish anything for His glory and our

brother's good in the grave, whither we are rapidly going. Let us by doubling our diligence, in some degree try to make up for past indifference and neglect; knowing as we do, if we refuse to consecrate our best energies to the noble and blessed work of saving the souls of the people around us, an overwhelming woe awaits us from which it will be impossible to escape. "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." From such terrible final condemnation may God in mercy save us!

Man is everywhere brother to man, and yet he leaves his fellows in *the deepest religious ignorance*. It is bad enough when man leaves his brother ignorant of the common elements of education, and ignorant of secular affairs in general; but infinitely worse when he leaves him ignorant of those things which belong to his spiritual peace both for the present and the everlasting future. It is mournful when man forgets his common brotherhood to those around him, but far more so when he forgets his Christian brotherhood. And yet this is done throughout Christendom all the year round by millions of professing Christians. We certainly hear in our day a great amount of talk about elevating the masses of society, about this man and that man and the other man being the man of the people. We own that for the most part we have no faith in this hollow talk, this empty profession of patriotism and philanthropy. The individual is lost sight of in the multitude. There is a vague conception of something great and grand to be accomplished, and it all ends in nothing. Man as an individual, man as man, is lost sight of and hardly anything

remembered but the masses, which on the lips of most people means a general something of which they have not very clear and definite ideas. Many of these charlatan philanthropists, these platform Christians, theorising so often with their feet comfortably to the fire, shed floods of tears over a tenderly told tale and permit the stern necessities of everyday life close by them to pass unpitied and unrelieved. The weakness and inconsistencies of such people bring real Christian philanthropy into contempt, and create a prejudice against religion which it is very difficult for the true-hearted to overcome. When you speak to men about their spiritual good who have so often been deceived and disgusted, they tell you Christianity is all cant, mere empty pretence, nothing better than hollow hypocrisy. It is indeed a painful thing to go into the back streets of the large towns and cities of our country; to talk to the sunken population huddled together like bees in a hive, about their spiritual interests; to endeavour to convince them that there is a God and a providence, and a Gospel of mercy to save and to bless them. They tell you that they cannot afford to have souls and to care for them; and it is next to impossible to persuade them that the Almighty really designs their happiness. Growing up as they have done amid the deepest spiritual ignorance, the grossest sensuality, the greatest selfishness, and the most irreligious example possible, it is not to be wondered at that they hardly believe in anything but what they daily see around them. Think of the multitudes thus wandering as sheep without a shepherd. Think too of God's solemn and heartrending language, "My people die for lack of knowledge." Do not neglect the untold millions of heathen

in the distant nations; but for God's sake think of the masses of home heathen, dark and benighted, at your own door in the nineteenth century of Christianity! We say think of all this, and then if you have a brotherly heart beating in your breast you must surely be prompted to deeds of Christian activity.

We must not rest content without the evangelisation of the whole human race. As all are our brothers they must all be properly cared for. Christianity is a religion for the world, and not simply for the Christendom of to-day. As the Apostles of Jesus were commanded to commence preaching the Gospel at Jerusalem, but afterwards to "go into all the world and preach that Gospel to every creature," so we in this age must first care for the home-work and then push out among the foreign heathen. This is the most reasonable and the most practical method of working. We require neither outfit nor passage-money, nor the learning of another language to reach the millions of degraded ones at home. It is the most economical use of our energies and resources to do the work at hand, and out of the evangelisation of our own country will grow a spiritual power that will mightily help the conversion of the world to Christ. But while we care for the brother who lives among us and has grown up at our side, we must not forget the brother in the regions beyond. Are we to leave him to perish in his ignorance and darkness? Is such a course of conduct in keeping with our Christian principles, or in harmony with the word and will of God? Did the great God ever forget the benevolence of His fatherly heart, and actually ordain that Christianity should be confined within the narrow circle of Christendom; and not rather tell her

to walk through the world in her benignity conferring her blessings on all mankind? We rejoice to believe that the universal Father has a large and fatherly heart, loving and caring for everybody; that in point of fact redemption is as extensive as the fall, and the command to make it known as wide as the world; and that as provision has been made for the whole human race this blessed intelligence is to be published to every fallen son of Adam. Shall we, therefore, be so intensely selfish as to keep the benefits of the Gospel to ourselves, when God never intended anything of the kind but the reverse? Let us diffuse the heavenly light, spread the knowledge of salvation, make it known to the ends of the earth that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." The way some men speak against foreign missions, reminding us that there are so many millions of heathens at home, as ignorant and depraved as any in heathen lands, is, we venture to think, very much devoid of the expansive charity of God's blessed Gospel. As they put the argument it means, Do nothing whatever for the heathen abroad till you have converted your own country. Well, as we have just intimated, we would not have you neglect home; do all in your power to convert England; but at the same time we beg you to put greater energy into your Christianity, and bring it to bear upon the dwellers in the ends of the earth that they also may see and enjoy the great salvation of God. The home and foreign work must both be attended to, since under Christianity the whole world is a neighbourhood and every man in it is our neighbour and brother.

If there be untiring Christian labour, comprehensive and enduring, *there must be genuine Christian affection.*

Let us seek Christian love in its unselfishness and pure spirituality, directed by wise experience and intelligence. Let it be a love embracing everybody, black and white, poor and rich, learned and ignorant; reaching to everything and making everything serve its purpose. Let it be a love imparting the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus principally, while it communicates all needful information respecting the present life. Such a love we presume to think is really essential to the highest welfare of society. O for a heaven-born charity suited to the times in which we live! To be so very much taken up with our little selves, so commonly eating our morsel alone, prevents true progress and hinders the highest elevation of society. Selfishness poisons every cup that is put to human lips, breaks every union that is formed for the good of others, and creates a Judas in every circle we may enter; it is the blight of all organisations and efforts for the glory of Christ and the brotherhood of men. But the noble and disinterested love of the Gospel will make us God-like. "God is love,"—loving to each and loving to all, a love that is universal and all-embracing. And from love in the heart there will spring practical sympathy, the tenderest and most active compassion. Not the false sentiment of the novel-reader that simply weeps and does nothing for anybody, but concludes that people have most effectually pitied the destitute and shown commiseration for the fallen, when they have felt deeply and let fall a shower of tears. Right and healthy feeling is as necessary as right views and principles. We have need to pray that God may keep both head and heart right, in order that the stream of our life may flow in the proper channel, and that we may become

the happy and honoured instruments of saving souls from death and hiding multitudes of sins.

The grand basis of brotherhood is thus seen to be identity of nature. Age after age men have thought, spoken and written on the subject of human brotherhood. Poets have sung about it, orators have declaimed upon it, philosophers have speculated about it, and modern reformers have tried hard to make it an accomplished fact, instead of a mere beautiful creation of the imagination with a gorgeous drapery of fancy thrown around it. And though age after age the prophecy of heart and hope has remained unfulfilled, and the ardent aspirations of noble souls been doomed to disappointment, men are still found earnestly looking for the dawn of a brighter day than has ever yet cheered the race. Surely all this is not a mere day-dream, not the result of a heated imagination. There must be some deep and broad truth lying at the bottom of it. We cannot understand what it is unless the grand fact that we are all the offspring of a Divine Father—created in the same Divine image, redeemed by the same sacrificial offering, and destined to live together through the same eternity; and simply on account of this identity of nature our common Father has ordained that we must dwell together for the development of intellect and sympathy and benevolence. We shall be stunted in the growth of mind and heart if we dwell apart from one another, and isolate ourselves from our brethren. Our nature in that case will not have full play; we shall become dwarfed and degraded beings. We can only reach the highest style of man through close and constant association with our fellows. In the solitude of the wilderness or the seclusion of the

monastery, we sacrifice the nobleness and grandeur of our manhood. As one writer very forcibly remarks, "There is no real progress for the individual but through social sympathy; there is no strong and enduring aspiration but in the fellowship of aspiring souls." And so it is evident that the belief in human brotherhood, and the deep yearning after its perfect attainment, spring out of our very nature as the children of a Parent in the skies, in whose blessed likeness we were first formed.

But patiently and nobly as men have toiled and struggled to establish a practical brotherhood—a brotherhood real and workable—they have so far utterly failed *because they have attempted to found a brotherhood apart from the Divine method.* Men have said, Do away with artificial life, and you will secure a happy brotherhood at once. But in patriarchal times there was beautiful simplicity which did not destroy selfishness and misery. Others have said, Give liberty to the natural passions; let human nature have unrestrained freedom. It was attempted in France in 1793, and produced the Reign of Terror. Some have said, Bring the world under one political form of government and you regain a lost Paradise. Alexander the Great and Napoleon Bonaparte tried to do it; and in the pathway of conquest there followed woe after woe like waves chasing each other on the ocean in the storm,—not establishing a brotherhood among men but leaving the great heart of humanity raw and bleeding. Others again have said, Level all distinctions of birth and fortune and men will everywhere become happy brothers immediately. Some have said, Highly civilise; and others have said, Highly educate. But all the methods of men completely fail to

bind humanity together in the bonds of a happy brotherhood, and will of necessity fail. However the Divine method, we believe, is destined to succeed, because "the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." The true bond of men is not class feeling, nor class interest, nor forms of government, nor intellectual culture, nor simple manners, nor permitting nature to grow up unrestrained in its freedom: not in any of these, not in all of these, but in oneness of nature and that nature changed and renewed by the grace of God. And if the Divine method does not succeed in uniting men and making them one according to the prayer of Jesus, "That they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us," having oneness of life, oneness of sympathy and effort; not only being one with God, but one with one another in the noblest and best sense—we say, if Christianity does not establish a true and blessed brotherhood of men, then humanity is completely given over to despair.

Human brotherhood rightly understood *does not interfere with the independence and individuality of men.* We feel an independent right to religious liberty; that no fellow-man, that no parliament, that no Church authority, that no earthly power whatever can bind our conscience or compel us to adopt a certain mode of worship or to receive one form of ecclesiastical government. We feel too our individuality; that we have our personal trials, temptations, sorrows, and mental struggles; that to a certain extent life is one of solitary conflict, like John's in the wilderness of Judæa, or that of a greater than John who said, "The hour cometh, and now is, when ye shall be scattered every

one to his own, and shall leave Me alone; and yet I am not alone, for the Father is with Me." We know that the blessed Master lived a lonely life of unequalled thought, unequalled purity, unequalled benevolence, and unequalled sorrow and suffering; but it is given to us in some humble degree to be like Him. We must all calculate on lonely wrestlings of spirit, and lonely days of work for God and our brother man. Other people will not understand us or appreciate our labour; but if all this blind us to the grand doctrine of brotherhood it will rob us of one of the most precious and powerful forces of individual life. By properly realising the fact of human brotherhood we gain faith, hope and comfort, both for ourselves and the race; we become wonderfully nerved for the battle of life; we are led more firmly to believe in the destiny of the race; and we console ourselves amid the failures of the present and the thought of the failures of the past, concluding that success will yet crown the plans of God and the efforts of Christian men. If the past has not come up to our ideal the religion of Jesus has accomplished more for the race than anything else; in fact it has done what nothing else could do. Only let it be fairly tried and it will bring back the blessedness of Eden. So far as it has been properly received and acted upon, it has never failed to raise man out of his brutishness and to confer on him the untold blessings of Christian life.

We know that multitudes will say, *Yes, but the Church itself is torn by divisions and jealousies and unfriendly rivalries;* and that this is not by any means a modern occurrence, but has existed from the days of Christ to this hour. This is quite true to a mournful extent; but let us

not mistake the nature of the case under consideration. Christianity is properly speaking a oneness of spirit under manifold varieties of thought and form. Death is the very perfection of uniformity; life is almost infinitely diversified. It is precisely so throughout the material, mental and social world; and may we not add the moral and spiritual? A world of living beauty has hills and dales, lakes and seas, rivers and woods; not interminable sameness but marvellous variety, and yet it is one harmonious whole. So it is with the true Church of Christ. All healthy life has its own individuality. When you destroy that you produce uniformity, but by the process you occasion death. Look at life as you see it in the world around you. In family life you have the fine manly strength, the robust independence of the father; the womanly tact and tenderness, the patient gentleness and inexhaustible affection of the mother; the implicit trust and loving obedience of the child; and yet family life with all its variety is one. Look at national life and you have the pushing energy of the merchant, the quiet thoughtfulness of the man of letters, the horny hand and rough strength of the artisan, the busy brain of the statesman, and the patient skill and unwearied toil of the medical man; and yet again with all this variety national life is one. Look at personal life and you have the sensitive brain and throbbing nerves, the beating heart, the bone and muscle, all in the same individual; and yet personal life is one. And so it is with Church life. In the Church you have different types of intellect, different temperaments, and different kinds of religious experience; and yet the Church is one notwithstanding these differ-

ences. We see then that uniformity is evidence of death, but variety is proof of life. It is precisely so in the world around us and in the Church of Christ. At first indeed the Church of Jesus appeared to be one glorious company of happy brothers. They sold what they possessed, placed the money at the feet of the Apostles, and had all things common; but this state of things did not last long. It is very doubtful whether in the nature of things it could possibly have lived on for many years longer than it actually did. The youthful vigour of life like that must give place to the calmer and wiser thoughtfulness of mature life. The child thinks, talks and acts as the child; but the full-grown man puts away childish things. When the early Church outgrew its infancy it acted like a man capable of thinking for himself and managing his own affairs. The Church became more reflective, and saw that its divine life did not consist in mere outward uniformity but in a much deeper thing—the oneness of spirit amid great diversity of opinion, thought and action.

The first announcement of Christianity was "peace on earth and good will toward men." Here was the distinct intimation of a new order of society to be effected by Christianity. Christ was to change the heart of the individual, and so to change social institutions and save the nations. Christ will work through social affections and relations, till the wolf lies down with the lamb and swords are converted into ploughshares; till His kingdom shall come and there is a universal reign of right, and peace, and purity, and truth, and love. Christianity is the most powerful element in the State; it in fact binds the social system together. The ideas of Christianity like seed put in the soil, or leaven put

in the meal, will grow and work till from the one we reap a universal golden harvest, and from the other the entire corrupt mass of humanity is completely leavened. Man is the heir of all the ages, is taught and trained by the history of the past for the kingdom of God on earth. All the dispensations of religion are intended to fit man for a blessed and universal Christian brotherhood. For this purpose Christianity takes hold of social dependence to teach us to trust in God. We learn by faith in parents, friends, and in one another, to have faith in God. Social training under the arrangement and providence of God is made to help Christian training; obedience to law prepares in some way and measure for the higher obedience to the law of God. All social virtues have their root in Christianity. However light has come it is light from heaven. The teachers of the nations—whether ancient or modern—in classic lands or on barbarian territory—got their inspiration from God either directly or indirectly. In due time came Jesus, born under the law and of a woman, to redeem and save those who were under the law. He was "the first-born among many brethren;" our human Elder Brother, doing all that the best of brothers could do, while at the same time He was "God over all blessed for evermore." He called Himself the Son of Man, and He really was this in the sense of belonging to the whole race. The Greek was everywhere a Greek; the Roman was everywhere a Roman; the Jew was everywhere a Jew; just as the Englishman is an Englishman all the world over. You cannot easily mistake nationality,—national peculiarities come out in modes of thought, in tastes, and in manners. But the Son of Man had none of these, was immensely

above these littlenesses; and so to speak belonged to humanity at large—to every race and to every age—having in Him the broad elements of universal humanity. He cared for all, sympathised with all, toiled for all, and at last by His death wrought out redemption for all. He was of our flesh and bone, thoroughly one with us, thought our human thoughts, felt our human feelings, spoke our human speech. So universal was His affection, so universal was His sympathy, so universal was His intellect, that He pre-eminently lays claim to the designation Son of Man. Never was man born of woman like Him and never will be again. And our Divine-human Brother is our model Brother! In Him existed all the virtues in full proportion; nothing was defective, nothing was lacking. He taught us how to live not only by the language of His lips, but also by the conduct of His life. We must study the law of God in the light of the life of Jesus. In Him you see filial obedience, secular diligence, attachment to the ordinances of religion, care for the rising generation, condescension to the poorest, pity for the outcasts of society, the most active benevolence, the deepest and most genuine humility, the highest and most enlightened zeal, the deepest devotion to life's great work, meekness under provocations, patience in suffering and trial, resignation to the will of the Father in the darkest and worst seasons, the true spirit of prayer, triumph over temptation, unfailing attachment to the word of God, loving fidelity in reproving sin, the sorrow of a patriot for His country, obedience to common law—working a miracle rather than evade a tax, faithfulness in friendship, bereavement and affliction, and perfect sociability amid marriage festivities. There was nothing

narrow or unhealthy in the moral and spiritual life of Jesus: in all respects He is our model.

The Christian brotherhood of earth is intended to fit us for the holy and immortal brotherhood of heaven. Free from trial, free from ignorance, free from evil, and happy beyond conception and expression, we shall dwell together in the most perfect brotherly intercourse world without end. "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is He of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." In Christ we are made brothers on earth, and this brotherhood, thank God! is unchanged and unbroken by death and removal into another world. Here families are broken up by death, scattered and divided by business or the necessities of life; and when the festive seasons come round — Christmas, Easter, or Whitsuntide—you feel the painful loss of the old familiar forms and faces. Yet the family love and fellowship do not die because of emigration to India or Australia: you keep up constant correspondence, and often find that "absence makes the heart grow fonder." The absent ones far away are not forgotten, but are in your thoughts and in your hearts to live and to die with them. Yes, and though you will never on earth "feel the touch of a vanished hand," or hear "the sound of a voice that is still," yet you do not forget or cease to love the departed ones. You know they are not dead but living; not annihilated but consciously existing in another state of being, and will by-and-by hail and receive you on the eternal shore. Visible intercourse is only interrupted for a little while; it will be restored immediately after death. The family exists, though at present divided by the narrow stream of death; the brotherhood is felt and real, though we cannot

hold communion in the flesh; but we know the blessed intercourse will shortly be resumed. By the aid of memory we recall the glorified ones; we as it were see and hear them. At times we half persuade ourselves that they are still very near to us, see us, know us, take an interest in us, understand our circumstances, and are in some sort our guardian angels; but ere long we shall dwell with them, know them again, and have more perfect communion with them than ever we enjoyed on earth. Yes; and our social circle will be greatly enlarged. We shall not merely be with our old friends and earthly relations who have departed in the faith and patience of Jesus, but with all the servants of God of every age and from every land. "In the dispensation of the fulness of time He will gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, even in Him." They were one on earth by deep devotion to a common Father, by blessed fellowship with a common Brother, by the Spirit's grace and light and life, and by the common service of faith and hope and love; and now in heaven they are one for evermore, having in common the blessed perfection of immortal brotherhood in knowledge, privilege, joy, fellowship and service, though some disobedient human brothers will be sentenced to penal servitude for life in the world to come.

God it is evident has made us our brother's keeper,—the keeper of his pardon, peace, hope, joy, and righteousness, since man is converted by the instrumentality of his fellow-man. But though God has arranged that we shall save and bless our brother, we have murdered him; we have murdered his soul, which is infinitely worse than murdering his body. The body has often perished by our

neglect and indifference, or by our cruel treatment, when there ought to have been the cultivation and exhibition of brotherly affection and sympathy. It has been so from the beginning to this day. In the first family that ever existed, and by the very first brother that breathed, an awful murder was committed; and since then in the succeeding families of the earth there has been the strange perpetration of a regular series of similar dark deeds. Yet modern thinkers tell us we are greatly mistaken in our estimate of human depravity; that in fact the human race is far from being so bad as we suppose and endeavour to paint it. We leave neologists to grapple with the facts of human history and experience, and earnestly urge you to do all that in you lies to lessen the natural moral and social misery of mankind. Especially we beg you to try to diminish the spiritual woe and wretchedness. This is often the most effectual method of lessening social and natural evil; but whatever becomes of the body the soul must be taken care of. As the guardians of immaterial and immortal souls, labour for the conversion of sinners; spare no pains to win men to Christ and to save them from hell. Possibly there are some in perdition who would have been in heaven had we done our duty. Shall others of our own flesh and blood be permitted to perish without strong and repeated efforts to save them? Can we sleep comfortably at night and eat our meals during the day in peace, while guilty of murdering soul after soul? Probably if we had murdered a fellow-being we should be miserable to our dying day, even though we escaped detection and punishment; but how very little horror and uneasiness people feel notwithstanding their Christianity after destroying precious and

blood-bought spirits, and those the souls of their own brothers! Let us henceforth toil hard to save souls. If you faithfully discharge your duty, zealously labour for the salvation of your brother man, God will bless you in your deed; those whom you are the instruments of converting will bless you; and the world will acknowledge that if society were but blest with more like you it would soon be a different world from what it is. Go then assured of Divine protection, assured of the love and sympathy of the Saviour, assured of the prayers and sympathy of the churches, assured of the blessing of heaven and earth,—go and do all in your power to make the world holier, happier and better, knowing on the authority of God's book that you shall "rest and stand in your lot at the end of the days."

What a loud and earnest protest we have in the subject of human brotherhood against all religious strife and bigotry. The very first quarrel there ever was on earth was a quarrel between two brothers, it was a quarrel about religion, and it ended in the martyrdom of righteous Abel. That was the commencement of hatred in the human race and persecution in the Church of God. Yes, and from that day to this it has more or less continued among men, not unfrequently terminating in the bloodshed of opponents and the martyrdom of the saints. Sad that men, and especially Christian brethren, should bite and devour one another and the whole quarrel turning on some insignificant and non-essential point! Well might Peter say to the Christians of his times, "Above all things have fervent charity among yourselves, for charity shall cover a multitude of sins." It is notorious that religious quarrels are of all quarrels the most bitter, and more bad blood is made by

them than by any other kind of disputes. Christian men coming together to discharge the temporal or spiritual business of the Church, often quarrel more over it than the same number of worldly gentlemen would in committee over some affair of the commonwealth. We do not say that Christian men should not honestly speak their opinions, but they should avoid unnecessarily wounding the feelings of their brethren. Bishop Wilson used to say, "Good-temper is nine-tenths of Christianity." Paul thought so too. (1 Cor. xiii.)

But if we live to purpose and serve our generation according to the will of God *we must strictly guard our personal piety.* The love of Christ must constrain us to perform self-denying deeds for His glory and the good of others. We must be thoroughly alive to God ourselves, loving Him with all our heart, mind, soul and strength, or we shall never love our neighbour as ourselves. It is a matter of personal experience, and we all know the truth of it, that when we are most devoted to God we feel we can do most for God. Let us seek then, as the disciples of Christ, greater love to Him, and from this love to the Saviour will flow a beautiful and constant stream of love to others. Some people weep bitterly as they read of the degradation and misery of their fellows, and having as they fancy effectually sympathised with them, do nothing more. Others are made so excessively happy by their religion that they can hardly do anything to make the world better. We would rather they were not so exquisitely happy, and did more to get the world converted. Love to the fallen helpless sons of Adam is not worth much unless it be something more than a passing feeling, an evaporating senti-

ment. It must be a ceaseless, patient, plodding, practical love if any good for anybody is to grow out of it. Such love is only found where the heart is thoroughly devoted to Christ, where religion is something more than a name and profession; where in fact Christianity is really a religion of self-denial and self-sacrifice, of principle and practice.

See from the whole subject your duty to your fellow-men and by God's grace resolve to do it. However low and debased man may be, remember he is your own brother. Value him for his high origin and immortal destiny. In him there are glorious possibilities. He is one of the sons of Adam, gifted with mind and conscience, and by the help of God you may yet succeed in making something grand and noble of him. The attempt will repay you a thousand-fold. "Go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," as did the blessed Redeemer, the early Christians, and our glorious forefathers in England, Scotland and Wales. Go not only to those who need you, "but to those who need you most," according to the noble maxim of Britain's greatest apostle—John Wesley. It is no compromise of Christian respectability to seek out the lowest and the worst: it is only following the glorious example of Christ. The lowest are the farthest from God and consequently the nearest to perdition. But the image of God, of which they are bereft by transgression, may be retraced on their spirits by the finger of the Holy Ghost. It is not a hopeless and impossible task to attempt to save them. It often happens that harlots and publicans enter the kingdom of God before respectable citizens. Now, as in the days of Jesus, notorious sinners are frequently saved first. Do not despair of their reformation and conversion. With hope and courage

do your duty. Your Father in heaven will smile well pleased on your efforts; your Elder Brother will stand by and defend you; and the objects of your prayers, sympathies and toils will bless God that ever you lived. The great home above will be all the happier to you if some be found there at last who would not have been in heaven but for your instrumentality. "Say ye there are four months, and then cometh harvest? Lift up your eyes and see, the fields are already white unto harvest." The corn is ripe but unreaped. It is wasting. Every wind that blows shakes out the precious grain. Immortal souls are perishing. "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest to send forth more labourers into His harvest." And go yourselves and thrust in the sickle, that you may gather fruit unto eternal life. Such efforts will make the present life blessed, and the next life infinitely more so. You will be rewarded with the approval of a good conscience, the gratitude of good men, the sincere love and thankfulness of those you are the instruments of saving, and above all with the smile and the "Well done" of the Great Master. Do not be anxious about getting away from the hard and difficult work God may allot you in this life; do not indulge the selfish wish to go to heaven till all is done God has assigned you; but rather desire to remain at your post however painful and trying it may be. Love hard work for God and your brother's good more than the reward it brings either here or hereafter.

When Joseph was sold into Egypt his brethren probably thought they would see him no more, and that so far as he was concerned the whole thing was done with. To their astonishment and confusion they discovered him in

Egypt. With greater confusion and dismay we shall meet at the bar of God the brother we have sold into spiritual Egypt. Our sin in this particular will be sure to find us out in this life, or the next, or in both. Shall we see the face of our brother in eternity with joy or grief?

When the rich man died, "and in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments," with the most impressive importunity he pleaded that Lazarus might be sent as a special messenger to warn ungodly ones left behind; "for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Had he neglected those brothers? Had he led them into deeper and yet deeper sin? Was he afraid that in perdition they would upbraid him with his neglect and leadership in evil? We know not; but we do know from the parable that memory exists in perdition, that life on earth can be reviewed, and that there is a danger of our own misery being increased by the company of companions in sin, or the presence of those we have injured and neglected in this life.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MEN;

OR, CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

NOTICES OF THE FIRST EDITION.

"With the calmness and clearness of a Christian philosopher Mr. Unsworth proceeds in his elegant little work to enforce this mutual dependence and mutual helpfulness. It is just the book to be circulated now that the battle between capital and labour has fairly begun."—*The Primitive Methodist.*

"This is a very sensible, plain-spoken, interesting, and Christian little work, on a subject of great social importance."—*The Methodist Family.*

"Sensible utterances on matters physical, social, and religious. that concern humanity. We are strongly convinced that Christian ministers should not let social topics entirely get out of their hands. Mr. Unsworth has done good service in handling some questions not generally introduced into the pulpit."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"It is a good, thoughtful, practical book."—*The Homilist.*

"Mr. Unsworth takes occasion to give some sound and practical advice, as well as boldly to speak his mind on social and physical questions not generally so thoroughly discussed as he would like to see them."—*Public Opinion.*

"The author writes in a clear, terse, vigorous style."—*New Connexion Magazine.*

"A very thoughtful treatise, which deals with good social questions in the right spirit. Such counsels as those contained in this little volume are greatly needed to meet the great and threatening difficulties which imperil our national prosperity in the present day."—*Baptist Magazine.*

"This little book throws out clearly and forcibly a large amount of useful practical thought on this important subject. What a different world this would be were the doctrines of this treatise recognised and acted upon."—*The Evangelical Magazine.*

"The writer says many wise words which are well worth listening to. We heartily commend this little book."—*United Methodist Free Church Magazine.*

"The work is written in a popular style, and aims at practical results. We consider it a serviceable book."—*Primitive Methodist Magazine.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE AGGRESSIVE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY.

"This is a practical and stirring book, well worthy of being read more than once."—*Irish Evangelist.*

"Mr. Unsworth is a vigorous and conclusive reasoner; his appeals to the conscience are singularly powerful."—*Baptist Magazine.*

"The book is full of power and manly words."—*United Methodist Free Churches Magazine.*

"A thoughtful, earnest, well-written, and very seasonable book. . . . Intensely and arousingly practical."—*Wesleyan Magazine.*

"Intelligent workers in the Church will do well to read this new treatise."—*The Methodist.*

"Mr. Unsworth states with force and ability what he considers to be the hindrances to Church work, and also what are really the qualifications requisite to make a Church successfully aggressive."—*Derby Mercury.*

"Will be read with interest by those outside the denomination to which Mr. Unsworth belongs."—*Literary World.*

"An earnest work, so full as to seem exhaustive of its subject."—*Sunday-School Chronicle.*

"An honest, healthy treatise."—*Dickinson's Theological Quarterly.*

"An earnest, thorough attempt to rouse the Church of Christ to a sense of her responsibility as the steward of the Gospel."—*Sword and Trowel.*

"Mr. Unsworth writes with vigour and enthusiasm. . . . His book is one calculated to arouse the torpid, and perhaps move some of the indifferent."—*Nonconformist.*

"Sensible and clear, ... practical and sound, and must do any one good who wishes to be useful."—*Hastings and St. Leonard's News.*

"Mr. Unsworth is a terse and vigorous writer; he deals with subjects of great importance, and has written thoughtfully and well. The chapter on 'Means of Aggression' especially merits careful perusal."—*The Christian.*

"We earnestly commend it to the notice of all the members of our churches, and especially to our ministers; . . . . we should hope it will influence them with a zeal which will lead them to preach and speak as with tongues of fire."—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,
2, CASTLE-STREET, CITY-ROAD, AND 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

ALSO BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

SELF-CULTURE AND SELF-RELIANCE;

UNDER GOD THE MEANS OF SELF-ELEVATION.

Crown 8vo. Fourth Thousand. Price 2s. 6d.

"Is a good book for young men."—*Lay Preacher.*

"A useful, intelligent little book; well fitted to stimulate and to point out the way to self-improvement."—*Literary World.*

"As a book for young men it deserves the heartiest recommendation."—*General Baptist Magazine.*

"We know of no book of its size that is so well adapted to secure the object it aims to accomplish."—*The Primitive Methodist.*

"Christian in its tone and teaching without being mawkish, and manly without being sentimental."—*Burton Weekly News.*

"His book is indeed full of judicious counsels, which every working man—especially every young man—would be wiser and better for following."—*Derby Mercury.*

"It deals with 'culture' in a masterly manner."—*Christian Age.*

"Full of wise counsels and valuable suggestions."—*The Congregationalist.*

"Faithful, incisive, thorough, . . . full of clear light as an electric lamp."—*Methodist Free Churches Magazine.*

"We do not know a better book on the subject than this."—*Hastings and St. Leonard's News.*

"This book contains some vigorous writing on important subjects, and we are glad to see this new and enlarged edition."—*The Methodist.*

"This is an earnest, thoughtful, eloquent book on an important subject. Though the topic is a serious one its pages are never dull, being pervaded with life and vigour, lit up with flashes of original thought, and brightened with apt illustrations."—*The Folkestone News.*

WESLEYAN CONFERENCE OFFICE,
2, CASTLE-STREET, CITY-ROAD, AND 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

Standard & Popular Works

PUBLISHED BY

T. WOOLMER, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.

PRICE SIX SHILLINGS.

The Light of the World: Lessons from the Life of Our Lord for Children. By the Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, DD., Author of *Rays from the Sun of Righteousness*, etc., etc., etc. Fcap. 4to. Numerous Illusts.

'A most attractive and deeply interesting Sunday book for children.'

PRICE FIVE SHILLINGS.

Consecrated Culture. Memorials of Benjamin Alfred Gregory, M.A. By the Rev. Dr. GREGORY. Crown 8vo, with Portrait.

Gems Reset; or, The Revised Wesleyan Catechisms Illustrated by Imagery and Narrative. By Rev. B. SMITH. Crown 8vo.

Tales and Poems of South India. By Rev. E. J. ROBINSON. Crown 8vo.

American Methodism, A Compendious History of. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Crown 8vo, with Portraits.

Sermons by the Rev. W. MORLEY PUNSHON, LL.D. With a Preface by the Rev. W. ARTHUR, M.A. These Sermons contain the latest Corrections of the Author. Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. 5/- each.

'Here we have found, in rare combination, pure and elevated diction, conscience-searching appeal, withering exposure of sin, fearless advocacy of duty, forceful putting of truth,' etc., etc.—*London Quarterly Review.*

Lectures by the Rev. W. MORLEY PUNSHON, LL.D. Crown 8vo.

'One and all of the Lectures are couched in the powerful and popular style which distinguished the great preacher, and they are worthy of a permanent place in any library.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

Toward the Sunrise: being Sketches of Travel in Europe and the East. To which is added a Memorial Sketch (with Portrait) of the Rev. W. MORLEY PUNSHON, LL.D. By HUGH JOHNSTON, M.A., B.D. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations.

Fiji and the Fijians; and Missionary Labours among the Cannibals. Sixth Thousand. Revised and Supplemented with Index. By Rev. JAMES CALVERT; and a Preface by C. F. GORDON CUMMING, Author of *At Home in Fiji*, etc. Crown 8vo, with Portrait of Thakombau, a Map, and numerous Illustrations.

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS.

Zoology of the Bible. By HARLAND COULTAS. Preface by the Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D. Imperial 16mo. 126 Illustrations.

Missionary Anecdotes, Sketches, Facts, and Incidents. By the Rev. WILLIAM MOISTER. Imperial 16mo. Eight Page Illustrations.

'The narratives are many of them very charming.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

The Brotherhood of Men; or, Christian Sociology. By Rev. W. UNSWORTH.

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

Rambles and Scrambles in the Tyrol. By Mrs. HENRY HILL. Crown 8vo, numerous Illustrations.

Uncle Jonathan's Walks in and Around London. Foolscap 4to. Profusely Illustrated.

Our Indian Empire: its Rise and Growth. By the Rev. J. SHAW BANKS. Imperial 16mo. Thirty-five Illustrations and Map.
'The imagination of the young will be fired by its stirring stories of English victories, and it will do much to make history popular.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

Northern Lights; or, Pen and Pencil Sketches of Twenty-one Modern Scottish Worthies. By Rev. J. MARRAT. Third Edition, enlarged. Crown 8vo. Portraits and Illustrations.
'It is a charming book in every sense.'—*Irish Evangelist.*

Our Sea-Girt Isle: English Scenes and Scenery Delineated. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Imperial 16mo. Map and 153 Illustrations.
'An unusually readable and attractive book.'—*Christian World.*

Rambles in Bible Lands. By the Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. Imperial 16mo. Seventy Illustrations.
'From the juvenile stand-point, we can speak in hearty commendation of it.'—*Literary World.*

'Land of the Mountain and the Flood': Scottish Scenes and Scenery Delineated. By the Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Imperial 16mo. Map and Seventy-six Illustrations.
'Described with taste, judgment, and accuracy of detail.'—*Scotsman.*

Popery and Patronage. Biographical Illustrations of Scotch Church History. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Imperial 16mo. Ten Illustrations.
'Most instructive biographical narratives.'—*Derbyshire Courier.*

Wycliffe to Wesley: Heroes and Martyrs of the Church in Britain. Imperial 16mo. Twenty-four Portraits and Forty other Illustrations.
'We give a hearty welcome to this handsomely got up and interesting volume.'—*Literary World.*

John Lyon; or, From the Depths. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Crown 8vo. Five Full-page Illustrations.
'Earnest and eloquent, dramatic in treatment, and thoroughly healthy in spirit.'—*Birmingham Daily Gazette.*

The Thorough Business Man: Memoir of Walter Powell, Merchant. By Rev. B. GREGORY. Eighth Edition. Crn. 8vo, with Portrait.

The Life of Gideon Ouseley. By the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Eighth Thousand. Crown 8vo, with Portrait.

The Aggressive Character of Christianity. By Rev. W. UNSWORTH.

Garton Rowley; or, Leaves from the Log of a Master Mariner. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crown 8vo.

Honest John Stallibrass. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crown 8vo.

A Man Every Inch of Him. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crn. 8vo.

Paul Meggitt's Delusion. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crown 8vo.

Nestleton Magna. A Story of Yorkshire Methodism. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Crown 8vo.

Chronicles of Capstan Cabin; or, the Children's Hour. By J. JACKSON WRAY. Imperial 16mo. Twenty-eight Illustrations.

PRICE THREE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE (*Continued.*)

Missionary Stories, Narratives, Scenes, and Incidents. By the Rev. W. MOISTER. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations.
'Intensely interesting.'—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

Scenes and Adventures in Great Namaqualand. By the Rev. B. RIDSDALE. Crown 8vo, with Portrait.

Melissa's Victory. By ASHTON NEILL. Crown 8vo, gilt edges. Illustrations by GUNSTON.

Two Saxon Maidens. By ELIZA KERR. Crown 8vo, gilt edges. Illustrations by GUNSTON.

Vice-Royalty; or, a Royal Domain held for the King, and enriched by the King. Crown 8vo. Twelve page Illustns. By Rev. B. SMITH.

Sunshine in the Kitchen; or, Chapters for Maid Servants. Fourth Thousand. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations. By Rev. B. SMITH.

Way-Marks: Placed by Royal Authority on the King's Highway. Being One Hundred Scripture Proverbs, Enforced and Illustrated. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Engravings. By Rev. B. SMITH.

The Great Army of London Poor. Sketches of Life and Character in a Thames-side District. By the River-side Visitor. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 540 pp. Eight Illustrations.
'Admirably told. The author has clearly lived and mingled with the people he writes about.'—*Guardian.*

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

Elias Power, of Ease-in-Zion. By Rev. JOHN M. BAMFORD. Seventh Thousand. Crown 8vo. Seventeen Illustrations. Gilt edges.

Life of John Wicklif. By Rev. W. L. WATKINSON. Portrait and Eleven Illustrations. Crown 8vo.

Good News for Children; or, God's Love to the Little Ones. By JOHN COLWELL. Crown 8vo, gilt edges. Fourteen Illustrations.

Pleasant Talks about Jesus. By JOHN COLWELL. Crown 8vo.

Little Abe; or, the Bishop of Berry Brow. Being the Life of Abraham Lockwood, a quaint and popular Local Preacher. By F. JEWELL. Crown 8vo, gilt edges. With Portrait.

Cecily: a Tale of the English Reformation. By EMMA LESLIE. Crown 8vo. Five full-page Illustrations.

Glimpses of India and Mission Life. By Mrs. HUTCHEON. Crown 8vo. Eight Page Illustrations.

The Beloved Prince: a Memoir of His Royal Highness, the Prince Consort. By WILLIAM NICHOLS. Crown 8vo. With Portrait and Nineteen Illustrations. Cloth, gilt edges.

The Hallam Succession. A Story of Methodist Life in Two Countries. By A. E. BARR. Crown 8vo. Frontispiece.

Fought and Won. A Story of School Life. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Crown 8vo, with Frontispiece.

Than Many Sparrows.' By ANNIE E. COURTENAY, Author of 'Tina and Beth.' Crown 8vo, with Frontispiece.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE (*Continued.*)

Glenwood: a Story of School Life. By JULIA K. BLOOMFIELD. Crown 8vo. Seven Illustrations.

'A useful book for school-girls who think more of beauty and dress than of brains and grace.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

Undeceived: Roman or Anglican? A Story of English Ritualism. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Crown 8vo.

'In the creation and description of character the work belongs to the highest class of imaginative art.'—*Free Church of England Magazine.*

Self-Culture and Self-Reliance, under God the Means of Self-Elevation. By the Rev. W. UNSWORTH. Crown 8vo.

'An earnest, thoughtful, eloquent book on an important subject.'—*Folkestone News.*

A Pledge that Redeemed Itself. By SARSON, Author of 'Blind Olive, etc. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations. Gilt edges.

'We are informed in the preface that it is "an etching from life," and we can well believe it, for it bears all the marks of a genuine study of living men and women.'—*Literary World.*

Old Daniel; or, Memoirs of a Converted Hindu. By the Rev. T. HODSON. Crown 8vo, gilt edges. Coloured Illustrations.

The Story of a Peninsular Veteran: Sergeant in the 43rd Light Infantry during the Peninsular War. Crown 8vo. 13 Illustrations.

'Full of adventure, told in a religious spirit. We recommend this narrative to boys and young men.'—*Hastings and St. Leonard's News.*

Rays from the Sun of Righteousness. By the Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. Crown 8vo. Eleven Illustrations. Gilt edges.

In the Tropics; or, Scenes and Incidents of West Indian Life. By the Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Crown 8vo, gilt edges, Illustrations, etc.

Climbing: a Manual for the Young who Desire to Rise in Both Worlds. By the Rev. BENJAMIN SMITH. Crown 8vo. Sixth Edition

Our Visit to Rome, with Notes by the Way. By the Rev. JOHN RHODES. Royal 16mo. Forty-five Illustrations.

The Lancasters and their Friends. A Tale of Methodist Life. By S. J. F. Crown 8vo.

Those Boys. By FAYE HUNTINGTON. Crown 8vo. Illustrated.

Leaves from my Log of Twenty-five years' Christian Work in the Port of London. Seventh Thousand. Crown 8vo. Eight Illustrations.

East End Pictures; or, More Leaves from My Log of Twenty-five Years' Christian Work. By T. C. GARLAND. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo. Portrait and Five Illustrations.

The Willow Pattern: A Story Illustrative of Chinese Social Life. By the Rev. HILDERIC FRIEND Crown 8vo, gilt edges. Numerous Illustrations.

Passages from the Diary of an Early Methodist. By RICHARD ROWE.

Orphans of the Forest; or, His Little Jonathan. By A. E. COURTENAY. Foolscap 8vo. Four Illustrations.

MARK GUY PEARSE'S WORKS.

Nine Volumes, Crown 8vo, Cloth, Gilt Edges. Price 2s. 6d. each.

1.—Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions. FIRST SERIES. 71,000.

2.—Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions. SECOND SERIES. 26,000.

3.—Sermons for Children. 20,000.

4.—Mister Horn and his Friends; or, Givers and Giving. 21,000.

5.—Short Stories, and other Papers. 8000.

6.—'Good Will': a Collection of Christmas Stories. 10,000.

7.—Simon Jasper. 11,000.

8.—Cornish Stories. 6000.

9.—Homely Talks. 10,000.

'Scarcely any living writer can construct a parable better, more quaintly, simply, and congruously. His stories are equally clever and telling. . . . One secret of their spell is that they are brimful of heart. . . . His books should be in every school library.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

Thoughts on Holiness. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Fifteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. Cloth, red edges.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.

Punchi Nona: A Story of Female Education and Village Life in Ceylon. By the Rev. SAMUEL LANGDON. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations.

Friends and Neighbours: A Story for Young Children. Crown 8vo. Illustrated.

The Oakhurst Chronicles: A Tale of the Times of Wesley. By ANNIE E. KEELING. Crown 8vo. Four Illustrations.
'This beautiful story.'—*Sheffield Independent.*
'A fascinating story.'—*Christian Age.*

Poet Toilers in Many Fields. By Mrs. R. A. WATSON. Crown 8vo. Thirteen Illustrations.

The 'Good Luck' of the Maitlands: a Family Chronicle. By Mrs. R. A. WATSON. Five Illustrations. Crown 8vo.

Valeria, the Martyr of the Catacombs. A Tale of Early Christian Life in Rome. By the Rev. W. H. WITHROW, D.D. Crown 8vo. Illustrations.

Tina and Beth; or, the Night Pilgrims. By ANNIE E. COURTENAY. Crown 8vo. Frontispiece.

Wilfred Hedley; or, How Teetotalism Came to Ellensmere. By S. J. FITZGERALD. Crown 8vo. Frontispiece.

Equally Yoked: and other Stories. By S. J. FITZGERALD. Frontispiece.

Master and Man. By S. J. FITZGERALD. Frontispiece.

Coals and Colliers; or, How we Get the Fuel for our Fires. By S. J. FITZGERALD. Crown 8vo. Illustrations.
'An interesting description of how we get the fuel for our fires, illustrated by tales of miners' families.'—*Christian World.*

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS *(Continued)*.

James Daryll; or, From Honest Doubt to Christian Faith. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Crown 8vo.

'We have seldom read a more beautiful story than this.'—*The Echo.*

The King's Messenger: a Story of Canadian Life. By the Rev. W. H. WITHROW, M.A. Crown 8vo.

Illustrations of Fulfilled Prophecy. By the Rev. J. ROBINSON GREGORY. Crown 8vo. Numerous Illustrations.

The Basket of Flowers. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, gilt edges.

The Great Apostle; or, Pictures from the Life of St. Paul. By the Rev. JABEZ MARRAT. Foolscap 8vo. 28 Illustrations and Map.

'A charming little book. . . . Written in a style that must commend itself to young people.'—*Sunday-School Times.*

Sir Walter Raleigh: Pioneer of Anglo-American Colonisation. By CHARLES K. TRUE, D.D. Foolscap 8vo. 16 Illustrations.

Homes and Home Life in Bible Lands. By J. R. S. CLIFFORD. Foolscap 8vo. Eighty Illustrations.

'A useful little volume respecting the manners and customs of Eastern nations. It brings together, in a small compass, much that will be of service to the young student of the Bible.'—*Watchman.*

Hid Treasures, and the Search for Them: Lectures to Bible Classes. By the Rev. J. HARTLEY. Foolscap 8vo. With Frontispiece.

Youthful Obligations. Illustrated by a large number of Appropriate Facts and Anecdotes. Foolscap 8vo. With Illustrations.

Eminent Christian Philanthropists: Brief Biographical Sketches, designed especially as Studies for the Young. By the Rev. GEORGE MAUNDER. Fcap. 8vo. Nine Illustrations.

The Tower, the Temple, and the Minster: Historical and Biographical Associations of the Tower of London, St. Paul's Cathedral, and Westminster Abbey. By the Rev. J. W. THOMAS. Second Edition. Foolscap 8vo. 14 Illustrations.

Peter Pengelly; or, 'True as the Clock.' By J. J. WRAY. Crown 8vo. Forty Illustrations.

'A famous book for boys.'—*The Christian.*

The Stolen Children. By Rev. H. BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Six Illustrations.

My Coloured Schoolmaster: and other Stories. By the Rev. H. BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Five Illustrations.

'The narratives are given in a lively, pleasant manner that is well suited to gain and keep alive the attention of juvenile readers.'—*The Friend.*

Female Heroism and Tales of the Western World. By the Rev. H. BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Four Illustrations.

Capture of the Pirates: with other Stories of the Western Seas. By the Rev. HENRY BLEBY. Foolscap 8vo. Four Illustrations.

'The stories are graphically told, and will inform on some phases of Western life.'—*Warrington Guardian.*

The Prisoner's Friend: The Life of Mr. JAMES BUNDY, of Bristol. By his Grandson, the Rev. W. R. WILLIAMS. Foolscap 8vo.

Adelaide's Treasure, and How the Thief came Unawares. By SARSON, Author of 'A Pledge that Redeemed Itself, etc. Four Illustrations.

PRICE TWO SHILLINGS (*Continued.*)

Kilkee. By ELIZA KERR.

Two Snowy Christmas Eves. By ELIZA KERR. Royal 16mo. Gilt edges. Six Illustrations.

The Secret of Ashton Manor House. By ELIZA KERR. Crown 8vo.

The Mystery of Grange Drayton. By ELIZA KERR. Crown 8vo.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE.

'Little Ray' Series. Royal 16mo.

Little Ray and her Friends. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Five Illustrations.

The Breakfast Half-Hour: Addresses on Religious and Moral Topics. By the Rev. H. R. BURTON. Twenty-five Illustrations.

'Practical, earnest, and forcible.'—*Literary World.*

Gleanings in Natural History for Young People. Profusely Illustrated.

Broken Purposes; or, the Good Time Coming. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Five Page Illustrations. Gilt edges.

The History of the Tea-Cup: with a Descriptive Account of the Potter's Art. By the Rev. G. R. WEDGWOOD. Profusely Illustrated.

The Cliftons and their Play-Hours. By Mrs. COSSLETT, Seven Page Illustrations.

The Lilyvale Club and its Doings. By EDWIN A. JOHNSON, D.D. Seven Page Illustrations.

'The "doings" of the club decidedly deserve a careful perusal.'—*Literary World.*

The Bears' Den. By E. H. MILLER. Six Page Illustrations.

'A capital story for boys.'—*Christian Age.*

Ned's Motto; or, Little by Little. By the author of 'Faithful and True,' 'Tony Starr's Legacy.' Six Page Illustrations.

'The story of a boy's struggles to do right, and his influence over other boys. The book is well and forcibly written.'—*The Christian.*

A Year at Riverside Farm. By E. H. MILLER. Royal 16mo. Six Page Illustrations.

'A book of more than common interest and power.'—*Christian Age.*

The Royal Road to Riches. By E. H. MILLER. Fifteen Illustrations.

Maude Linden; or, Working for Jesus. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Four Illustrations.

'Intended to enforce the value of personal religion, especially in Christian work. . . . Brightly and thoughtfully written.'—*Liverpool Daily Post.*

Oscar's Boyhood; or, the Sailor's Son. By DANIEL WISE, D.D. Six Illustrations.

'A healthy story for boys, written in a fresh and vigorous style, and plainly teaching many important lessons.'—*Christian Miscellany.*

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE *(Continued)*.

Summer Days at Kirkwood. By E. H. MILLER. Four Illustrations.

'Capital story; conveying lessons of the highest moral import.'—*Sheffield Post*.

Holy-days and Holidays; or, Memories of the Calendar for Young People. By J. R. S. CLIFFORD. Numerous Illustrations.

'Instruction and amusement are blended in this little volume.'—*The Christian*.

Talks with the Bairns about Bairns. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Illustrated.

'Pleasantly written, bright, and in all respects attractive.'—*Leeds Mercury*.

My First Class: and other Stories. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Illustrated.

'The stories are full of interest, well printed, nicely illustrated, and tastefully bound. It is a volume which will be a favourite in any family of children.'—*Derbyshire Courier*.

Luther Miller's Ambition. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Gilt edges. Illustrated by GUNSTON.

'Wee Donald' Series.' Royal 16mo.

An Old Sailor's Yarn: and other Sketches from Daily Life.
The Stony Road: a Tale of Humble Life.
Stories for Willing Ears. For Boys. By T. S. E.
Stories for Willing Ears. For Girls. By T. S. E.
Thirty Thousand Pounds: and other Sketches from Daily Life.
'Wee Donald': Sequel to 'Stony Road.'

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE. *Foolscap 8vo Series.*

Martin Luther, the Prophet of Germany. By the Rev. J. SHAW BANKS. Foolscap 8vo. 13 Illustrations.

'Told in a very attractive style.'—*London Quarterly Review*.

Two Standard Bearers in the East: Sketches of Dr. DUFF and Dr. Wilson. By Rev. J. MARRAT. Eight Illustrations.

Three Indian Heroes: the Missionary; the Soldier; the Statesman. By the Rev. J. SHAW BANKS. Numerous Illustrations.

David Livingstone, Missionary and Discoverer. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Fifteen Page Illustrations.

'The story is told in a way which is likely to interest young people, and to quicken their sympathy with missionary work.'—*Literary World*.

Columbus; or, the Discovery of America. By GEORGE CUBITT. Seventeen Illustrations.

Cortes; or, the Discovery and Conquest of Mexico. By GEORGE CUBITT. Nine Illustrations.

Pizarro; or, the Discovery and Conquest of Peru. By GEORGE CUBITT. Nine Illustrations.

Granada; or, the Expulsion of the Moors from Spain. By GEORGE CUBITT. Seven Illustrations.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE (*Continued.*)

James Montgomery, Christian Poet and Philanthropist. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Eleven Illustrations.

The Father of Methodism: the Life and Labours of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M. By Mrs. COSSLETT. Forty-five Illustrations.

'Presents a clear outline of the life of the founder of Methodism. The illustrations are numerous and effective,—quite a pictorial history in themselves.'

Old Truths in New Lights: Illustrations of Scripture Truth for the Young. By W. H. S. Illustrated.

Chequer Alley: a Story of Successful Christian Work. By the Rev. F. W. BRIGGS, M.A.

The Englishman's Bible: How he Got it, and Why he Keeps it. By the Rev. JOHN BOYES, M.A. Thirteen Illustrations.

Home: and the Way to Make Home Happy. By the Rev. DAVID HAY. With Frontispiece.

Helen Leslie; or, Truth and Error. By ADELINE. Frontispiece.

Building her House. By Mrs. R. A. WATSON. Five Illustns.

'A charmingly written tale, illustrative of the power of Christian meekness.'—*Christian World.*

Crabtree Fold: a Tale of the Lancashire Moors. By Mrs. R. A. WATSON. Five Illustrations.

Davy's Friend: and other Stories. By JENNIE PERRETT.

'Excellent, attractive, and instructive.'—*The Christian.*

Arthur Hunter's First Shilling. By Mrs. CROWE.

Hill Side Farm. By ANNA J. BUCKLAND.

The Boy who Wondered; or, Jack and Minnchen. By Mrs. GEORGE GLADSTONE.

Kitty; or, The Wonderful Love. By A. E. COURTENAY.

The River Singers. By W. ROBSON.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE. *Crown 8vo Series.*

Laurence Temple's Probation; or, Life in a Canadian Parsonage. By Dr. WITHROW.

May's Captain. By HELEN BRISTON. Three Illustrations.

The Little World of School. By R. RYLANDS. Three Illustrations.

Patty Thorne's Adventures. By Mrs. H. B. PAULL. Illustrated.

The Dairyman's Daughter. By the Rev. LEGH RICHMOND, M.A. A New Edition, with Additions, giving an Authentic Account of her Conversion, and of her connection with the Wesleyan Methodists.

Footsteps in the Snow. By ANNIE E. COURTENAY, Author of *Tina and Beth*, etc., etc. Illustrated.

'Every page is genial, warm, and bright.'—*Irish Christian Advocate.*

The Beloved Prince: A Memoir of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By WILLIAM NICHOLS. Nineteen Illustrations.

Drierstock: A Tale of Mission Work on the American Frontier. Three Illustrations.

PRICE EIGHTEENPENCE (*Continued.*)

Go Work: A Book for Girls. By ANNIE FRANCES PERRAM.

Picture Truths. Practical Lessons on the Formation of Character, from Bible Emblems and Proverbs. By JOHN TAYLOR. Thirty Illustrations.

Those Watchful Eyes; or, Jemmy and his Friends. By EMILIE SEARCHFIELD. Frontispiece.

The Basket of Flowers. Four Illustrations.

Auriel, and other Stories. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Frontispiece.

A Voice from the Sea; or, The Wreck of the Eglantine. By RUTH ELLIOTT.

Rays from the Sun of Righteousness. By the Rev. R. NEWTON. Eleven Illustrations.

A Pledge that Redeemed Itself. By SARSON.

In the Tropics; or, Scenes and Incidents of West Indian Life. By the Rev. J. MARRAT. Illustrations and Map.

Old Daniel; or, Memoirs of a Converted Hindu. By Rev. T. HODSON. Twelve Illustrations.

Little Abe; or, The Bishop of Berry Brow. Being the Life of Abraham Lockwood.

CHEAP EDITION OF MARK GUY PEARSE'S BOOKS.
Foolscap 8vo. Price Eighteenpence each.

1. Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions. 1ST SERIES.
2. Daniel Quorm, and his Religious Notions. 2ND SERIES.
3. Sermons for Children.
4. Mister Horn and his Friends; or, Givers and Giving.
5. Short Stories: and other Papers.
6. 'Good Will': a Collection of Christmas Stories.
7. Simon Jasper.
8. Cornish Stories.
9. Homely Talks.

PRICE ONE SHILLING. *Imperial 32mo. Cloth, gilt lettered.*

Abbott's Histories for the Young.
Vol. 1. Alexander the Great. Vol. 2. Alfred the Great. Vol. 3. Julius Cæsar.

PRICE ONE SHILLING. *Royal 16mo. Cloth, gilt lettered.*

Ancient Egypt: Its Monuments, Worship, and People. By the Rev. EDWARD LIGHTWOOD. Twenty-six Illustrations.

Vignettes from English History. From the Norman Conqueror to Henry IV. Twenty-three Illustrations.

Margery's Christmas Box. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Seven Illusts.

No Gains without Pains: a True Life for the Boys. By H. C. KNIGHT. Six Illustrations.

Peeps into the Far North: Chapters on Iceland, Lapland, and Greenland. By S. E. SCHOLES. Twenty-four Illustrations.

Lessons from Noble Lives, and other Stories. 31 Illustrations.

PRICE ONE SHILLING (*Continued.*)

Stories of Love and Duty. For Boys and Girls. 31 Illusts.

The Railway Pioneers; or, the Story of the Stephensons Father and Son. By H.C. KNIGHT. Fifteen Illustrations.

The Royal Disciple: Louisa, Queen of Prussia. By C.R. HURST. Six Illustrations.

Tiny Tim: a Story of London Life. Founded on Fact. By F. HORNER. Twenty-two Illustrations.

John Tregenoweth. His Mark. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Twenty-five Illustrations.

'I 'll Try'; or, How the Farmer's Son became a Captain. Ten Illustrations.

The Giants, and How to Fight Them. By Dr. RICHARD NEWTON. Fifteen Illustrations.

The Meadow Daisy. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Numerous Illustrations.

Robert Dawson; or, the Brave Spirit. Four Page Illustrations.

The Tarnside Evangel. By M. A. H. Eight Illustrations.

Rob Rat: a Story of Barge Life. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Numerous Illustrations.

The Unwelcome Baby, with other Stories of Noble Lives early Consecrated. By S. ELLEN GREGORY. Nine Illustrations.

Jane Hudson, the American Girl. Four Page Illustrations.

The Babes in the Basket; or, Daph and her Charge. Four Page Illustrations.

Insect Lights and Sounds. By J. R. S. CLIFFORD. Illustrns.
'A valuable little book for children, pleasantly illustrated.'—*The Friend.*

The Jew and his Tenants. By A. D. WALKER. Illustrated.
'A pleasant little story of the results of genuine Christian influence.'—*Christian Age.*

The History of Joseph: for the Young. By the Rev. T. CHAMPNESS. Twelve Illustrations.
'Good, interesting, and profitable.'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

The Old Miller and his Mill. By MARK GUY PEARSE. Twelve Illustrations.

The First Year of my Life: a True Story for Young People. By ROSE CATHAY FRIEND.
'It is a most fascinating story.'—*Sunday School Times.*

Fiji and the Friendly Isles: Sketches of their Scenery and People. By S. E. SCHOLES. Fifteen Illustrations.
'We warmly recommend this little volume to readers of every sort.'—*Hastings and St. Leonard's News.*

The Story of a Pillow. Told for Children. Four Illustrations.
'Simply and gracefully told.'—*Bradford Observer.*

UNCLE DICK'S LIBRARY OF SHILLING BOOKS.

Foolscap 8vo. 128 pp. Cloth.

Uncle Dick's Legacy. By E. H. MILLER, Author of 'Royal Road to Riches,' etc., etc. Illustrated.
'A first-rate story . . . full of fun and adventure, but thoroughly good and healthy.'—*Christian Miscellany.*

Beatrice and Brian. By HELEN BRISTON. Three Illustrns.
'A very prettily told story about a wayward little lady and a large mastiff dog, specially adapted for girls.'—*Derbyshire Advertiser.*

Becky and Reubie; or, the Little Street Singers. By MINA E. GOULDING. Three Illustrations.
'A clever, pleasing, well-written story.'—*Leeds Mercury.*

Gilbert Guestling; or, the Story of a Hymn Book. Illustrated.
'It is a charmingly told story.'—*Nottingham Daily Express.*

Guy Sylvester's Golden Year. Three Illustrations.
'A very pleasantly written story.'—*Derbyshire Courier.*

Left to Take Care of Themselves. By A. RYLANDS. Three Illustrations.

Tom Fletcher's Fortunes. By Mrs. H. B. PAULL. Three Illustrations.
'A capital book for boys.'—*Sheffield and Rotherham Independent.*

The Young Bankrupt, and other Stories. By Rev. JOHN COLWELL. Three Illustrations.

The Basket of Flowers. Four Illustrations.

Mattie and Bessie; or, Climbing the Hill. By A. E. COURTENAY.

Tom: A Woman's Work for Christ. By Rev. J. W. KEYWORTH. Six Illustrations.

The Little Disciple: The Story of his Life Told for Young Children. Six Illustrations.

Afterwards. By EMILIE SEARCHFIELD. Three Page Illustns.

Poppie's Life Service. By EMILIE SEARCHFIELD. Ten Illustrations.

Mischievous Foxes; or, the Little Sins that mar the Christian Character. By JOHN COLWELL. Price 1s.
'An amazing amount of sensible talk and sound advice.'—*The Christian.*

Joel Bulu: The Autobiography of a Native Minister in the South Seas. New Edition, with an account of his Last Days. Edited by the Rev. G. S. ROWE. Foolscap 8vo, cloth. Price 1s.

Robert Moffat, the African Missionary. By Rev. J. MARRAT. Foolscap 8vo, Illustrated. Price 1s.

The Dairyman's Daughter. By the Rev. LEGH RICHMOND, M.A. A New Edition, with Additions, giving an Authentic Account of her Conversion, and of her connection with the Wesleyan Methodists.

Polished Stones from a Rough Quarry. By Mrs. HUTCHEON. Price 1s.

Recollections of Methodist Worthies. Fcap 8vo. Price 1s.
'Deserves to be perused by members of all Christian communities.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

PRICE NINEPENCE. *Imperial 32mo. Cloth, gilt lettered.*

1. The Wonderful Lamp: and other Stories. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Five Illustrations.
2. Dick's Troubles: and How He Met Them. By RUTH ELLIOTT. Six Illustrations.
3. The Chat in the Meadow: and other Stories. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
4. John's Teachers: and other Stories. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
5. Nora Grayson's Dream: and other Stories. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Seven Illustrations.
6. Rosa's Christmas Invitations: and other Stories. By LILLIE MONTFORT. Six Illustrations.
7. Ragged Jim's Last Song: and other Ballads. By EDWARD BAILEY. Eight Illustrations.
8. Pictures from Memory. By ADELINE. Nine Illustrations.
9. The Story of the Wreck of the 'Maria' Mail Boat: with a Memoir of Mrs. Hincksman, the only Survivor. Illustrated.
10. Passages from the Life of Heinrich Stilling. Five Page Illustrations.
11. Little and Wise: The Ants, The Conies, The Locusts, and the Spiders. Twelve Illustrations.
12. Spoiling the Vines, and Fortune Telling. Eight Illusts.
13. The Kingly Breaker, Concerning Play, and Sowing the Seed.
14. The Fatherly Guide, Rhoda, and Fire in the Soul.
15. Short Sermons for Little People. By the Rev. T. CHAMPNESS.
16. Sketches from my Schoolroom. Four Illustrations.
17. Mary Ashton: A True Story of Eighty Years Ago. 4 Illusts.
18. The Little Prisoner: or, the Story of the Dauphin of France. Five Illustrations.
19. The Story of an Apprenticeship. By the Rev. A. LANGLEY. Frontispiece.
20. Mona Bell: or, Faithful in Little Things. By EDITH M. EDWARDS. Four Illustrations.
21. Minnie Neilson's Summer Holidays, and What Came of Them. By M. CAMBWELL. Four Illustrations.
22. After Many Days; or, The Turning Point in James Power's Life. Three Illustrations.
23. Alfred May. By R. RYLANDS. Two coloured Illustrations.
24. Dots and Gwinnie: a Story of Two Friendships. By R. RYLANDS. Three Illustrations.
25. Little Sally. By MINA E. GOULDING. Six Illustrations.
26. Joe Webster's Mistake. By EMILIE SEARCHFIELD. Three Illustrations.
27. Muriel; or, The Sister Mother.
28. Nature's Whispers.
29. Johnny's Work and How he did it. Five Illustrations.
30. Pages from a Little Girl's Life. By A. F. PERRAM. Five Illustrations.
31. The Wrens' Nest at Wrenthorpe. By A. E. KEELING. Five Illustrations.

PRICE EIGHTPENCE. *Imperial 32mo. Cloth, gilt edges.*

The whole of the Ninepenny Series are also sold in Limp Cloth at Eightpence.

Ancass, the Slave Preacher. By the Rev. HENRY BUNTING.
Archie and Nellie; What they Saw and What they Heard. By RUTH ELLIOTT.
Bernard Palissy, the Huguenot Potter. By A. E. KEELING.
Brief Description of the Principal Places mentioned in Holy Scripture.
Bulmer's History of Joseph.
Bulmer's History of Moses.
Christianity Compared with Popery: A Lecture.
Daddy Longlegs and his White Heath Flower. By NELLIE CORNWALL.
Death of the Eldest Son (The). By CÆSAR MALAN.
Emily's Lessons; Chapters in the Life of a Young Christian.
Fragments for Young People.
Freddie Cleminson.
Janie: A Flower from South Africa.
Jesus (History of). For Children. By W. MASON.
Little Nan's Victory. By A. E. COURTENAY.
Martin Luther (The Story of).
Precious Seed, and Little Sowers.
Recollections of Methodist Worthies. Foolscap 8vo, limp cloth.
Sailor's (A) Struggles for Eternal Life.
Saville (Jonathan), Memoirs of. By the Rev. F. A. WEST.
Soon and Safe: A Short Life well Spent.
Sunday Scholar's Guide (The). By the Rev. J. T. BARR.
The Wreck, Rescue, and Massacre: an Account of the Loss of the *Thomas King*.
Will Brown; or, Saved at the Eleventh Hour. By the Rev. H. BUNTING.
Youthful Sufferer Glorified: A Memorial of Sarah Sands Hay.
Youthful Victor Crowned: A Sketch of Mr. C. JONES.

THE CROWN SERIES. *16mo. Cloth, gilt lettered. Coloured Frontispiece.* PRICE SIXPENCE.

1. A Kiss for a Blow: true Stories about Peace and War for Children.
2. Louis Henrie; or, The Sister's Promise.
3. The Giants, and How to Fight Them.
4. Robert Dawson; or, the Brave Spirit.
5. Jane Hudson, the American Girl.
6. The Jewish Twins. By Aunt FRIENDLY.
7. The Book of Beasts. 35 Illust.
8. The Book of Birds. 40 Illust.
9. Proud in Spirit.
10. Althea Norton.
11. Gertrude's Bible Lesson.
12. The Rose in the Desert.
13. The Little Black Hen.
14. Martha's Hymn.
15. Nettie Mathieson.
16. The Prince in Disguise.
17. The Children on the Plains.
18. The Babes in the Basket.
19. Richard Harvey; or, Taking a Stand.
20. Kitty King: Lessons for Little Girls.
21. Nettie's Mission.
22. Little Margery.
23. Margery's City Home.
24. The Crossing Sweeper.
25. Rosy Conroy's Lessons.
26. Ned Dolan's Garret.
27. Little Henry and his Bearer.
28. The Woodman and his Dog.
29. Johnny: Lessons for Little Boys.
30. Pictures and Stories for the Little Ones.
31. A Story of the Sea: and other Incidents.
32. Aunt Lizzie's Talks about Remarkable Fishes. 40 Illusts.
33. Three Little Folks who Mind their own Business; 25 Illustrations.
34. The Dairyman's Daughter.

The whole of the above thirty-four Sixpenny books are also sold at Fourpence, in Enamelled Covers.

PRICE SIXPENCE. *18mo. Cloth, gilt lettered.*

African Girls; or, Leaves from the Journal of a Missionary's Widow.
Bunyan (John). The Story of his Life and Work told to Children. By E. M. C.
Celestine; or, the Blind Woman of the Pastures.
Christ in Passion Week; or, Our Lord's last Public Visit to Jerusslem.
Crown with Gems (The). A Call to Christian Usefulness.
Fifth of November; Romish Plotting for Popish Ascendency.
Flower from Feejee. A Memoir of Mary Calvert.
Good Sea Captain (The). Life of Captain Robert Steward.
Grace the Preparation for Glory: Memoir of A. Hill. By Rev. J. RATTENBURY.
Joseph Peters, the Negro Slave.
Hattie and Nancy; or, the Everlasting Love. A Book for Girls.
Held Down; or, Why James did Not Prosper.
Matt Stubbs' Dream: A Chrlstmas Story. By M. G. PEARSE.
Michael Faraday. A Book for Boys.
Our Lord's Public Ministry.
Risen Saviour (The).
St. Paul (Life of).
Seed for Waste Corners. By Rev. B. SMITH.
Sorrow on the Sea; or, the Loss of the *Amazon*.
Street (A) I've Lived in. A Sabbath Morning Scene.
Three Naturalists: Stories of Linnæus, Cuvier, and Buffon.
Young Maid-Servants (A Book for). Gilt Edges.

PRICE FOURPENCE. *Enamelled Covers.*

Precious Seed, and Little Sowers.
Spoiling the Vines.
Rhoda, and Fire in the Soul.
The Fatherly Guide, and Fortune Telling.
Will Brown; or, Saved at the Eleventh Hour.
Ancass, the Slave Preacher. By the Rev. H. BUNTING.
Bernard Palissy, the Huguenot Potter.
The Story of Martin Luther. By Rev. J. B. NORTON.
Little Nan's Victory.

The whole of the thirty-four books in the Crown Series at Sixpence are sold in Enamelled Covers at FOURPENCE each.

PRICE THREEPENCE. *Enamelled Covers.*

'The Ants' and 'The Conies.'
Concerning Play.
'The Kingly Breaker' and 'Sowing the Seed.'
'The Locusts' and 'The Spiders,'
Hattie and Nancy.
Michael Faraday.
John Bunyan. By E. M. C.
Three Naturalists: Stories of Linnæus, Cuvier, and Buffon.
Celestine; or, the Blind Woman of the Pastures.
Held Down; or, Why James didn't Prosper. By Rev. B. SMITH.
The Good Sea Captain. Life of Captain Robert Steward.

PRICE TWOPENCE. *Enamelled Covers.*

1. The Sun of Righteousness.
2. The Light of the World.
3. The Bright and Morning Star.
4. Jesus the Saviour.
5. Jesus the Way.
6. Jesus the Truth.
7. Jesus the Life.
8. Jesus the Vine.
9. The Plant of Renown.
10. Jesus the Shield.
11. Being and Doing Good. By the Rev. J. COLWELL.
12. Jessie Allen's Question.
13. Uncle John's Christmas Story.
14. The Pastor and the Schoolmaster.
15. Laura Gaywood.

The above Twopenny Books are also sold in Packets.

Packet No. 1, containing Nos. 1 to 6, Price 1/-
Packet No. 2, containing Nos. 7 to 12, Price 1/-

PRICE ONE PENNY. *Crown 16mo. Enamelled Covers. With Illustrations.*

1. The Woodman's Daughter. By LILLIE M.
2. The Young Pilgrim: the Story of Louis Jaulmes.
3. Isaac Watkin Lewis: a Life for the Little Ones. By MARK GUY PEARSE.
4. The History of a Green Silk Dress.
5. The Dutch Orphan: Story of John Harmsen.
6. Children Coming to Jesus. By Dr. CROOK.
7. Jesus Blessing the Children. By Dr. CROOK.
8. 'Under Her Wings.' By the Rev. T. CHAMPNESS.
9. 'The Scattered and Peeled Nation': a Word to the Young about the Jews.
10. Jessie Morecambe and Her Playmates.
11. The City of Beautiful People.
12. Ethel and Lily's School Treat. By R. R.

The above twelve books are also sold in a Packet, price 1/-

PRICE ONE HALFPENNY.

By MARK GUY PEARSE, LILLIE MONTFORT, RUTH ELLIOTT, and others. *Imperial 32mo. 16 pages. With Frontispiece.*

1. The New Scholar.
2. Is it beneath You?
3. James Elliott; or, the Father's House.
4. Rosa's Christmas Invitations.
5. A Woman's Ornaments.
6. 'Things Seen and Things not Seen.'
7. Will you be the Last?
8. 'After That?'
9. Christmas; or, the Birthday of Jesus.
10. The School Festival.
11. John's Teachers.
12. Whose Yoke do You Wear?
13. The Sweet Name of Jesus.
14. My Name; or, How shall I Know?
15. Annie's Conversion.
16. The Covenant Service.
17. The Chat in the Meadow.
18. The Wedding Garment.
19. 'Love Covereth all Sins.'
20. Is Lucy V——— Sincere?
21. He Saves the Lost.
22. The One Way.
23. Nora Grayson's Dream.
24. The Scripture Tickets.
25. 'Almost a Christian.'
26. 'Taken to Jesus.'
27. The New Year; or, Where shall I Begin?
28. The Book of Remembrance.
29. 'Shall we Meet Beyond the River?'
30. Found after Many Days.
31. Hugh Coventry's Thanksgiving.
32. Our Easter Hymn.
33. 'Eva's New Year's Gift.'
34. Noble Impulses.
35. Old Rosie. By MARK GUY PEARSE
36. Nellie's Text Book.
37. How Dick Fell out of the Nest.
38. Dick's Kitten.
39. Why Dick Fell into the River.
40. What Dick Did with his Cake.
41. Dick's First Theft.
42. Dick's Revenge.
43. Alone on the Sea.
44. The Wonderful Lamp.
45. Not too Young to Understand.
46. Being a Missionary.
47. Willie Rowland's Decision.
48. 'Can it Mean Me?'
49. A Little Cake.
50. A Little Coat.
51. A Little Cloud.
52. The Two Brothers: Story of a Lie. By MARK GUY PEARSE.

The above Series are also sold in Packets.

Packet No. 1 contains Nos. 1 to 24. Price 1/-

Packet No. 2 contains Nos. 25 to 48. Price 1/-

LONDON:

T. WOOLMER, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.